Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BS2615 .J12p
Jackson, Henry Latimer, 1851-1926MAIN
The problem of the Fourth gospel / by H.
3 9967 00114 6906

ACCESSION NUMBER
45933.
SHELF NUMBER
BS
2615
J12
The Virginia Library
McCormick
Theological Seminary
of the
Presbyterian Church, Chicago.
From the Fund.
RECEIVED Dec. 1918.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_T5-DGQ-307

THE PROBLEM
OF
THE FOURTH GOSPEL

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER

LONDON
FETTER LANE, E.C. 4

EDINBURGH
100 PRINCES STREET

NEW YORK: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, MADRAS: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
TORONTO: J. M. DENT AND SONS, LTD.
TOKYO: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

All rights reserved

THE PROBLEM

OF

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

BY

H. LATIMER JACKSON, D.D.,

of Christ's College, Cambridge; sometime Hulsean Lecturer;
Author of *The Fourth Gospel and some recent German Criticism*, *The Present State of the Synoptic Problem* (*Cambridge Biblical Essays*), *The Eschatology of Jesus*, etc.

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1918

VIRGINIA LIBRARY
MCCORMICK
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BS
2615
J12p

TO

THE MASTER AND FELLOWS

OF

CHRIST'S COLLEGE

. . . . . deep feelings had impress'd
Great objects on his mind, with portraiture
And colour so distinct, that on his mind
They lay like substances, and almost seem'd
To haunt the bodily sense.

WORDSWORTH, *The Excursion*.

PREFACE

IF I venture the following personal explanation, the reason is simply and solely this: I have been advised clearly to define the relations between the present volume and a little work of mine which, published about a dozen years ago, was entitled *The Fourth Gospel and some recent German Criticism.*

Let me accordingly inform the reader that, when asked for a second edition of a work which—so, at all events, people were good enough to tell me—had served a useful purpose, I was for some time loth to acquiesce in such altogether unexpected but certainly encouraging suggestions. It was, indeed, far from being the case that, because the fates had determined that I should stray into Synoptic fields and the region of Eschatological research, I had therefore ceased to be fascinated by the Johannine literature *en masse*, and in particular by the very noble treatise which bears the name of 'John': on the contrary, I had actually betaken myself to what bade fair to be a prolonged and laborious attempt to trace connecting links between the 'Schmerzenskind der Theologie' (as Pfleiderer calls the Fourth Gospel) and that great writing of—may I say it? uncertain provenance which is designated 'The Epistle to the Ephesians.' My hesitation was, of course, partly due to natural reluctance even temporarily to forsake a work which was already rising on the stocks; it was, however, mainly grounded in a difficulty which stared me in the face. To put the matter in a nut-shell: I was speedily compelled to realize that, were any action taken in response to the aforesaid kindly suggestions, it would mean that time must be found for the drastic re-writing of a work which I could but turn to with added dissatisfaction and no small measure of dissent. Mere revision was not to be thought of.

Somehow or other time has been found—or rather made; and in the event the present volume arrives at its completion.

SYNOPSIS OF CONTENTS

PAGES

PREFACE vii–ix

INTRODUCTORY xix–xxiv

'Religious eclipse'; reasons for and features of display, p. xix. Attention concentrated on Jesus; theological specialists responsive to present-day demands; Biblical research, aim and methods, pp. xx–xxii. Gospel criticism, false impressions and baseless apprehensions, pp. xxii–xxiii. Right attitude to adopt, pp. xxiii–xxiv.

CHAPTER I

'THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST JOHN' 1–7

The 'favourite' Gospel, p. 1. Prepossessions and convictions; the gauntlet thrown down to traditional belief; survey of Fourth Gospel criticism from its inception to modern times, pp. 2–5. Re-assuring words, p. 6. The Jesus of the First Three Gospels, and 'the problem of the Person of Christ,' p. 7.

CHAPTER II

APPROXIMATE DATE OF THE GOSPEL 8–17

Rise of a distinctively Christian literature; 'many' Gospels; four remain masters of the field; different orders of sequence; the titles, significance of κατά; while the Synoptics are 'sister-works' the 'Fourth Gospel' in a category by itself, pp. 8–10. Preliminary inquiry as to its approximate date; the two extreme limits: Irenaeus and Heracleon, the *terminus ad quem* in any case not later than A.D. 180, pp. 10–11. The *terminus a quo*; Fourth Evangelist acquainted with the Synoptics, hence his Gospel subsequent to the latest of the 'sister-works,' uncertainty as to date of Mt. and Lk.; an 'entweder—oder,' pp. 11–12. Evidence more or less suggestive for nearer dating of 'John's' Gospel:—2 Pet., the Alogi, Second Epistle of Clement (so-called), Shepherd of Hermas, the *Didache*, Epistle of Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Justin Martyr, the docetic Gospel of Peter, Papias and Polycarp, Ignatius, Epistle to Diognetus, Basilides and the Valentinians, pp. 12–16. Provisional conclusion; Fourth Gospel prior to *ca.* A.D. 135, not earlier than date of the latest Synoptic Gospel—either *ca.* A.D. 75–80 or close of the first century, p. 17.

CHAPTER III

AUTHORSHIP IN TRADITION 18–30

A confident verdict. At this stage question strictly confined to external evidence; support not lacking for the 'orthodox opinion,' p. 18. Eusebius, pp. 19–20. Origen, p. 20. Irenaeus, pp. 20–21. The Alogi, Monarchian Prologue, Muratorian Canon, pp. 21–23. Clement of Alexandria, pp. 23, 24. Irenaeus, Polycarp, Polycrates, pp. 24–26. Threads gathered up; Theophilus of Antioch; situation complicated by appearance of 'John the Presbyter'; the crucial passage from Papias; Eusebius on Papias and Irenaeus; inferences; the two tombs at Ephesus, pp. 26–28. Difficulty of identifying the Beloved Disciple with the Apostle John, conceivable death by martyrdom of the latter; two traditions ultimately combined in assertions as to two Johns of Ephesus; one John only to be reckoned with, p. 29. Concluding remarks; external evidence far from conclusive for traditional authorship, pp. 29, 30.

CHAPTER IV

INTERNAL EVIDENCE 31–48

Provisional decisions hitherto arrived at; inquiry now passes from external to internal evidence; questions raised by such evidence both direct and indirect; p. 31.

(i) *Direct Evidence*

Diversity of opinion relative to 'self-witness' of the Gospel, pp. 32, 33. Examination of crucial passages; the 'we' of Jn i, 14, 16, pp. 33, 34; the *crux* of commentators, Jn xix, 35, significance of ἐκεῖνος, pp. 34, 35; the perplexing verses Jn xxi, 24, 25, pp. 35–38. Literary sanctions of the ancient world; no question of 'libelling the dead,' the Fourth Evangelist not necessarily the '*falsarius*' if one who made himself 'organ' of the eye-witness, pp. 38, 39. The 'self-testimony' of the Gospel raises more riddles than it solves, p. 39.

(ii) *Indirect Evidence*

The field widens; issues numerous, here narrowed down as the Gospel is taken by itself apart, pp. 39, 40. Its author writes for a Gentile community, p. 40. Is not a Gentile but a Jew; and, probably, a Jew of Palestine, pp. 40–42. Generally familiar with scenes depicted; not guilty of slip in respect of topography, pp. 42, 43. Yet doubt awakened by manner of allusion to Caiaphas: ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου, pp. 43, 44. Questions raised by the discourse-matter; monotony of idea and diction, constructed speeches, pp. 44–46.

Tentative conclusions prompted by the internal evidence in its two forms, pp. 47, 48.

CHAPTER V

THE JOHANNINE AND THE SYNOPTIC REPRESENTATION 49–82

Jewish scholarship on the Jewish background and provenance of a Gospel which is now to be confronted with the Synoptics; sharp contrast affirmed, alleged peculiarity of the Johannine representation, pp. 49–51. General remarks on the Synoptic Gospels; differences between them and 'John' which might reasonably be expected, pp. 51–53. Comparison instituted as follows:

(i) *Chronology*

Beginning, duration, of the Ministry; Cleansing of the Temple; the 'Death-day' of Jesus, pp. 53–58.

(ii) *Scene of the Ministry*

Discrepancy as stated; not so certain that the representations are mutually exclusive; reasons why the Fourth Evangelist preferred to accentuate that Judaean Ministry which the Synoptists by no means exclude, pp. 58–60.

(iii) *John the Baptist*

The two portraits; neither of them, perhaps, true to life; process of subordination of John to Jesus; in the Johannine representation the Baptist is a foil to Jesus; Baptist-disciples of a later day, pp. 60, 61.

(iv) *Miracle*

Summarized contentions; question of 'the miraculous,' pp. 61, 62. Omission by Fourth Evangelist of demoniac-cures, pp. 62, 63. Enumeration of the Johannine 'signs,' pp. 63, 64. Admissions as to enhancement, and purpose, pp. 64, 65. The Johannine 'signs' from the modern point of view; the Evangelist in the main concerned with their symbolism; 'outward narrative' and spiritual significance, pp. 66–68.

(v) *The Discourses*

Objections, the Synoptic and Johannine representations deemed mutually exclusive; Justin Martyr on the sayings of Jesus, pp. 68–70. Monotony pervading Fourth Gospel; apt statement of the position; arguments relative to manner and matter of speeches placed in the lips of the Johannine Christ, pp. 70–73. A contrast too sharp to be explained away; the real hearers of the Johannine Christ, pp. 73, 74.

(vi) *The Synoptic and Johannine portraits of Jesus*

The categorical 'either—or' of past and present criticism, p. 75. According to the Marcan representation Jesus is true man, exceptionally great, exalted above purely human greatness, pp. 75–77. The Johannine

Christ a regal personage, transcends mere manhood, features indicating real humanity, pp. 78–80. Resemblance admitted; the two portraits nevertheless diverse in type; predominance of the λόγος over the σάρξ in the Fourth Gospel representation, p. 80.

Summary and conclusions

Contrast between the two representations insufficiently accounted for by natural diversity as between author and author. In respect to some points it has perhaps been exaggerated; yet it must be admitted in the case of others, viz. the miraculous, the discourse-matter, portraits of Jesus. To turn from the Synoptics to the Fourth Gospel is to breathe a different atmosphere, to be transported to a world of Greek life and thought, pp. 81, 82.

CHAPTER VI

THE SELF-DATING OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL 83–96

Recapitulation; question for discussion, the Gospel in its relation to event, circumstance, movement, of period, p. 83. Rising headed by Bar Cochba, pp. 83, 84. Marcion and his followers, pp. 85, 86. Baptist-disciples, Ebionites, Montanism, pp. 86, 87. Gnosticism, summarized account of; Pauline Epistles pp. 87–90. Heracleon and Basilides; two extreme positions stated; Fourth Gospel points to a day when Basilides and Valentinian had not yet elaborated their systems, pp. 90, 91. Possible extent of life-time of the Beloved Disciple; not absolutely necessary to date Gospel within life-time of any actual eye-witness; reasons precluding very early date, pp. 91, 92. The Paschal controversy; Polycarp and Anicetus; *rationale* of Quarto-decimanism, three views as to; doubtful whether the perplexing question throws light on date of Fourth Gospel, pp. 92–96. Perhaps safe to place it in the period A.D. 100 (? 90)–125. Attitude of the Evangelist to Roman State, p. 96, note.

CHAPTER VII

LITERARY STRUCTURE OF THE GOSPEL 97–104

Processes of combination and compilation in the case of Old and New Test. writings generally; question at issue in respect of Fourth Gospel, pp. 97, 98. Contentions for unity, divergent opinions as to appendix chapter, pp. 98, 99. The Gospel widely held to be a composite work; 'partitionists' and 'revisionists,' pp. 99, 100. Features presented; dis-arrangements, p. 101. Interpolations, apparent difference of conception, the discourse-sections, pp. 101–103. Provisional conclusions; working hypothesis, pp. 103, 104.

CHAPTER VIII

THE MAKING OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL 105–123

Three-fold question for consideration; (*a*) authorship of main fabric of Gospel, growing tendency to look away from the Apostle John, pp. 105, 106. Conjectures and hypotheses which fasten on the author of 'Ephesians'; on author of Epistle to the Hebrews who is identified with Apollos; on one who, a Samaritan by birth, may have known the Beloved Disciple (who is Andrew) in Parthia; on the Beloved Disciple who is really the Gnostic Menander; on John Mark, pp. 107–110. Significance of all such conjectures, p. 110. Tentative conclusions; identity of Fourth Evangelist remains undisclosed, pp. 110, 111. (*b*) Method adopted by him in composition of his work; question of 'inspiration': period of systematic preparation, sources, material; actual composition long time in hand; his work composite yet a unity, pp. 111–114. (*c*) Processes whereby Fourth Gospel assumed its present form: conjectures, pp. 114, 115. Disarrangement and dislocation, pp. 115, 116. Attempt to distinguish between Evangelist and redactor (or redactors); preliminary considerations, p. 116. Two sections ruled out by textual criticism; of the appendix chapter; xix, 35; allusions to Beloved Disciple and to Caiaphas; iii, 11; passages and sections suggestive of another mind, illustrating diversity of view, pp. 117–119. Recorded manifestations of Risen Lord, pp. 119–121. The Prologue, pp. 121, 122. Concluding remarks, pp. 122, 123.

CHAPTER IX

THEN—AND NOW 124–141

Summary of results, pp. 124, 125. Personality of the Evangelist; contrasted with Philo, pp. 125–127. His purpose; to what extent polemical; addresses himself primarily to the 'ye' of xx, 31; seeks to confirm disciples and friends in the faith to which he himself has risen, yet with wider circles in his mind, pp. 127–129. Wherein the great service rendered by him for his own day consisted; type of the true free-thinker and liberator within the Christian Church, perhaps object of suspicion and distrust; inviting controversy his Gospel looked askance at; was it intended to be a 'permanent Gospel'?, pp. 129–131. Its significance and value for the modern world; glimpses afforded by it of the circumstances and conditions of its own period, pp. 131, 132. While not imperative to rule it out altogether as a source for the Life of Jesus, it must be used with caution, pp. 132, 133. The real Jesus and the Christ of the Evangelist's experience; Christology of the Gospel, its significance relative to unsolved problem of the Person of Christ, pp. 133, 134. Some main points: (*a*) reflexions suggested by this time of war; Mr Lloyd George on inadequacy of materialistic national ideals—'man cannot live by bread alone'; great ideal upheld by the Gospel, pp. 134, 135. (*b*) Insists on spiritual worship as against exaggerated importance attached to otherwise legitimate and helpful ceremonial, pp. 135, 136. (*c*) Spectacle of a rent and tattered Christendom; 're-union' much in men's minds;

Gospel points from external uniformity to unity in diversity, pp. 136, 137. (*d*) A period of transition, pressing need to provide new embodiment for newly-apprehended truth; what the Evangelist essayed and wrought in and for his own times; how he serves as present-day guide, his message, pp. 137–139. Suggestiveness of the promise xvi, 13, p. 139. Creeds and creed-construction on lines indicated by the Evangelist, pp. 139, 140. Vision of accomplished unity in diversity for Christendom, for humanity, pp. 140, 141.

EXCURSUS I

THE DEATH OF JOHN SON OF ZEBEDEE 142–150

Jülicher's hypothesis, John the Apostle met a 'tragic end.' The prediction Mk x, 35–40 = Mt. xx, 20–25, expectation suggested by it, pp. 142, 143. Statement attributed to Papias by Georgius Hamartolus and Philip of Side, divergent opinions respecting its value; tentative conclusion, pp. 143–145. The statement apparently supported by notices and allusions, as follows: (*a*) Heracleon as cited by Clem. Alex., (*b*) apocr. Martyrdom of Andrew and alleged conclave at Jerusalem, (*c*) Syriac Martyrology, (*d*) Aphrahat, pp. 145–147. Of unequal value, yet cumulative effect, pp. 147, 148. Of the historicity of incident recorded Mk x, 35–40, p. 148. Assumption being that the Apostle John met a violent end, questions of locality and date; no longer easy to dismiss story of martyrdom as 'altogether untrustworthy,' pp. 148–150.

EXCURSUS II

THE BELOVED DISCIPLE 151–170

Questions raised, p. 151. Fourth Gospel references to Beloved Disciple (xiii, 23 ff.; xviii, 15 ff.; xix, 25 ff.; xx, 2 ff.; xxi, 1–24), impressions conveyed by them, pp. 150–154. Whether a real personage or an ideal figure, pp. 154, 155. On assumption of a real man, question of identity with the son of Zebedee; remarks on habit, inveterate with many, of taking the Gospels as a single work; composite biographies, by consequence, offered of Apostle John, pp. 155, 156. The son of Zebedee as he figures in the Synoptics, in Acts, in Galatians; what suggested by the notices; room for conjectures, pp. 156–159. Fragmentary tradition; stories related of aged disciple of Ephesus who in course of time is identified with the Apostle; comparison instituted between the Synoptic John and the Johannine Beloved Disciple; the question is of two distinct personages, pp. 160–164. Conjectures which identify the Beloved Disciple with Judas Iscariot; with Nathaniel; with Lazarus; with the John of Acts iv, 5; with the 'certain young man' of Mk xiv, 51; with Aristion; with the rich young ruler (Mk x, 17 pars), pp. 164–168. Discussion of 'phrase of blessed memory'; of the term ἐπιστήθιος; unsafe to differentiate between ὃν φιλεῖς and ἠγάπα; two alternatives in respect of Beloved Disciple sections of Fourth Gospel, pp. 168–170. Identity of the Beloved Disciple—if a real person—in any case undisclosed, p. 170.

ABBREVIATIONS

AV	*Authorised Version.*
CB	*The Century Bible* (Eng. text, A.V. and R.V., with notes).
CBE	*Essays on some Biblical Questions of the day, by Members of the Univ. of Cambridge* (Edited by H. B. Swete, D.D.).
CTE	*Essays on some Theological Questions of the day, by Members of the Univ. of Cambridge* (Edited by H. B. Swete, D.D.).
DB	Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*
DCG	Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.*
DAC	Hastings' *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church.*
EB	*The Encyclopaedia Biblica.*
Einl. or Intr.	*Einleitung, Introduction.*
Exp.	*The Expositor* (Edited by Sir W. R. Nicoll).
GHD	*The Gospels as Historical Documents,* by V. H. Stanton, D.D.
HBNT	*Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Tübingen, edited by Lietzmann).
HCNT	*Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament* (Tübingen, Freiburg and Leipzig).
HE	Eusebius, *Histor. Eccles.*
HJ	*The Hibbert Journal.*
JE	*The Jewish Encyclopaedia.*
JTS	*The Journal of Theological Studies.*
LXX	*The Septuagint.*
LZ	*Literarisches Zentralblatt.*
NKZ	*Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift.*
NTAF	*The New Testament in the Apos. Fathers* (Oxford Society of Histor. Theology).
RGG	*Die Religion in der Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Tübingen, edited by Schiele).
RV	*Revised Version.*
Schw. TZ	*Schweiz. Theol. Zeitschrift.*
SK	*Studien und Kritiken.*
SNT	*Die Schriften des Neuen Testamentes* (edited by Joh. Weiss).
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung.*
TR	*Theologische Rundschau.*
TS	*Texts and Studies* (Cambridge).
TT	*Theolog. Tijdschrift* (Haarlem).
TU	*Texte und Untersuchungen.*
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.*
ZWT	*Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie.*

INTRODUCTORY

'Our age is one of religious eclipse[1].' Decades have elapsed since the remark was penned, but, in view of enhanced unsettlement and perplexity, it is aptly descriptive of the present situation. Nor are reasons for such 'eclipse' far to seek; they point not only to wide-spread restlessness in every department of human life, but, in particular, to discovery in the realm of physical science, to explorations in the comparatively new field of Comparative Religion, last but not least to new aims and methods and results in respect of Biblical Research. It is patent that, in educated circles, the church-going habit, if retained, is often accompanied by a sense of inquietude and loss, and that assent to traditional belief ever and again ceases to be half-hearted and merges in definite negation[2]; as for the less instructed masses, restraint may be put on gibe and scoff, but numbers stand doggedly aloof, not necessarily from religion, but from organized Christian life[3]. Again it might be said with truth: 'at the present moment two things about the Christian religion must surely be clear to anybody with eyes in his head. One is, that men cannot do without it; the other, that they cannot do with it as it is[4].'

The latter assertion, no doubt, hits the mark. As for its immediate predecessor, it is still based on solid fact; in that symptoms are numerous which testify to strong desires for 'dogmatic views and conceptions which, better grounded than the "Katechismusweisheit" of the traditional theology, shall the better harmonize with modern thought[5].' Unbelief, aloofness, hostility to ecclesiasticism, there may be;—the signs of the times[6] are such as to

[1] Goldwin Smith, *In Quest of Light*, p. 39.

[2] A recent little book entitled *An Englishman's Farewell to his Church* is pathetically significant.

[3] Cf. Soltau, *Unsere Evangelien*, p. 2.

[4] Matthew Arnold, *God and the Bible*, p. xiv.

[5] Soltau, *ibid.*

[6] Among them might, perhaps, be reckoned the eager demand for such a book as Mr H. G. Wells' *God the Invisible King*.

suggest that 'the great body of mankind will not long live without a faith[1].'

And let it be remarked that, if unsettlement and dissatisfaction in the sphere of religious thought and action there undoubtedly be, it is nevertheless certain that—with natural variety of manifestation in individual cases—the 'Founder of Christianity' has not ceased to occupy an exalted place in human minds. It is not one man only who forces himself to ask: 'What have I come to think of Christ[2]'? the self-same question is being raised in many quarters, nor is effort spared in anxious search for answers which shall in some sort satisfy the inquirer and end suspense. In no preceding century has attention been so concentrated on Jesus as is the case in the modern world[3]; to him all eyes are directed[4]. 'Amidst the crumbling of old forms and institutions, when that new order is dawning for which one and all hope but which no one may as yet discern, the gaze is riveted on Jesus with an intensity hitherto unknown. That precisely at this juncture he has some word for us and we great need of him is not so much an intellectual perception as a profound consciousness which is overwhelming for the inmost soul[5].' Or to turn from continental scholarship: 'I have yet to hear one college man among all the thousands I have taught speak but in admiration of him' if the view in the main stops short at the belief that 'He really lived and that He was the profoundest ethical teacher the world had produced,' is the striking testimony but lately borne by a University Professor in the United States[6]. Turning once again to England, it is a distinguished Jew who says: 'Perhaps in the future Christianity and Judaism will be able to shake hands over the Sermon on the Mount and the fundamental elements in the moral and religious doctrine of Jesus[7].'

[1] Munger, *Freedom of Faith*, p. 6. Cf. Percy Gardner, *The Ephesian Gospel*, p. 354.

[2] *Diary of a Church-goer*, p. 74. *What think ye of Christ?* is, by the way, the title of a little book from the pen of C. E. Raven which, if inviting sharp criticism, is in many ways suggestive.

[3] Westermann, *ZTK*, xv, p. 523.

[4] Seeberg, *NKZ*, xiv, pp. 437 ff.

[5] Wernle, *Quellen des Lebens Jesu*, p. 1.

[6] Carl Holliday, *HJ*, xv, p. 302.

[7] Montefiore, *Synop. Gospels*, i, p. cvii.

Thus, the wide world over, does the case appear to stand. Then let us remark further that the problems which are to-day exercising the minds of thousands—of whom many, by reason of insufficient knowledge, are in sore need of help and guidance—have long been, and still are, grappled with by specialists in the diverse fields of theological research. If a duty laid in particular on this age be that of fearless and withal reverent investigation into sources, it is fully realized by scholars who, both at home and abroad, are, unquestionably, showing themselves alive to the demand; and, one and all concerned for truth, deep seriousness and transparent honesty of purpose go with them to their work[1]. Rightly conceived of, their unremitting toil is in reality a response to 'the desire of Christendom' (nor yet of Christendom alone) 'for the fullest and most exact knowledge possible of the historic life and ministry of Jesus[2]'; and to them gratitude is due for that 'now, again, in our own times, the human Christ has come back to us in the fulness of His manhood[3].' Truly this is so; yet the reminder is timely that 'for our knowledge of what... He is to-day, we do not depend on our Scriptures; other evidence, vast and varied, is forthcoming in the *gesta Christi* in the history of the world[4].'

To make room here for a word or two as to the lines followed by critical students of the Bible literature generally; and on the attitude towards them which non-specialists may reasonably adopt.

It was said in effect at the outset, that 'in these days we have to reckon with a combination of new studies, with new methods, and new results of study.' Again to make use of borrowed words: 'The study of the past has become a science'; and, while in time past the student was 'content to glean from early records a picturesque or a majestic story,' more precise now is his aim and more precise are his methods. He is forced to define; he 'analyses his authorities, compares them, weighs them in the balances of his

[1] Instances of levity and flippancy are rare.

[2] Wendt, *St John's Gospel*, p. 1. See also Gunkel, *Zum religionsgesch. Verständnis des N.T.*, Vorwort.

[3] Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius*, p. 208.

[4] Bethune-Baker, *Sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, 8th June*, 1913.

critical judgement'; he discriminates sources, and, taking account of differences, gauges their significance; and essays to estimate whatever historical values they may possess. 'Chronicles become documents which he has to interpret, to reduce to their original elements of fact and romance'; the one only thing which it is his business to discover and present is Truth, and he accordingly works on as convinced that 'in the end there will come a great reward in pure and trustworthy knowledge.' Nor is the case otherwise when, the question no longer pointing to secular literature, the writings which constitute the 'Divine Library' are the field of research; on the contrary, both aim and method are essentially the same. It was inevitable that so it should be in respect of the varied writings of the Old Testament; and as inevitable was it that a time should come when, as it actually has come, inquiry should fasten on the varied contents of the New Testament, in particular on the records of the Life of Jesus. 'Christianity is a historical religion'; as such it distinctly challenges that historical investigation which finds its focal point and centre in Gospel criticism[1].

Gospel Criticism. It is a fearsome thing for many a devout soul which not seldom labours under the false impression that criticism is but another word for wholesale denial and rejection. By well-meaning if scarcely well-informed upholders of 'the Old Gospel' as against 'the New Theology' it is often blatantly denounced. With curious disregard of claims justly advanced by, or on behalf of, masculine types of intelligence, it is asserted of those engaged in it that they are occasion of stumbling to that 'weaker brother' whose pose, in point of fact, is often highly suggestive of riding rough-shod over others while expecting and demanding consideration for himself[2]. As if Truth itself were endangered by honest

[1] F. H. Chase, *Supernatural Elements*, pp. 4–6; *CTE*, pp. 374 ff. See also Bethune-Baker, *Sermon*. Dr Bethune-Baker's remarks on 'what is called a moderate criticism' should be carefully noted and digested.

[2] 'Experience...tends to show that it is the rams, rather than the lambs, that at right and especially at wrong times, are wont to let the world know that they are being scandalized. It is not the really spiritually poor, but your obstinate and noisy dogmatists who raise a hue and cry when free inquiry demands the right to move within the religious as within all other spheres,' Höffding, *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 3.

and industrious search for Truth, or 'such an invalid as to be able to take the air only in a close carriage[1]!' Not so thought St Paul; hence the 'prove all things[2]' which came from him.

What, then, is the right attitude to adopt? Most surely not one which argues either timorousness or hostility. There is no ground for the one or the other; there being so much to make it evident that, if there be some apparent loss, it is more than compensated by the great gain which has already issued, and is issuing, from scholarly investigation of the Bible literature;—and by no means only in the case of the Old Testament scriptures; 'new light' has been, and is being, shed in abundance on those of the New Testament also. And besides, Gospel Criticism, inevitable as it was, has come to stay; this recognized, the wiser course is not only to allow its reasonableness but to welcome it, to make the most of what it has to teach[3]. As was said some years ago: 'Instead of using the Gospels to foreclose inquiry, we must use the results of inquiry to interpret the Gospels. Let inquiry proceed, the light shall help us, as we reverently welcome and use it,' without necessarily accepting every new hypothesis, but as ever testing 'the hypotheses with a vigorous scrutiny; or, if we cannot test them ourselves, we shall wait till others whom we trust have tested them[4].' Or, as was said more recently by one in whom the trust desiderated can be safely placed: 'I cannot doubt that the evolution of the conception of the conditions of our Lord's life on earth, which is coming with our fresh study of the Gospels, will enhance the appeal that the living Christ is making to us in these our times —His times. As we realize more fully the extent to which the Son of God "emptied Himself" to enter on a really human life, to

[1] Oliver Wendell Holmes.

[2] 1 Thess. v, 21. The Bishop of Ballarat, Dr A. V. Green (*Ephes. Canon. Writings*, pp. 3 ff.), is not slow to urge the point. 'On a quelque peine à se représenter l'état d'esprit de gens qui, d'une part, proclament l'autorité souveraine de la parole du Christ, le salut par Christ seul, et qui, d'autre part, se refusent à toute étude critique des évangiles,' Réville, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, p. ii. The whole passage should be read.

[3] A pioneer of Fourth Gospel criticism, Ballenstedt, has some highly suggestive remarks to the same effect in the opening pages of his *Philo und Johannes* (publ. 1802).

[4] J. Armitage Robinson, *Some Thoughts on Inspiration*, p. 47.

learn from all the experiences "of joy and woe, and hope and fear," with no supernatural panoply to blunt the edge of any one of them that each of us may not obtain:—the appeal He makes to us will not be less persuasive and convincing than of old[1].'

It is in such a mind and temper that the ordinarily instructed reader should approach and acquaint himself with the works of some of the many scholars who have concentrated their attention on a document which bears the time-honoured title of 'The Gospel According to St John.'

[1] Bethune-Baker, *Sermon; Nestorius*, p. 208.

CHAPTER I

'THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST JOHN'

It was once said of a Japanese gentleman who became a Christian: 'The vision of glory which came to him while reading John's account of Our Lord's Life and Teaching was a vision from another and diviner world; he fell at the feet of Christ, exclaiming, "My Lord and My God." ... He saw the Divine majesty and the Divine grace of Christ; what could he do but worship Him?[1]'

Beautiful are the words. Springing, who can doubt it? from the inmost experiences of the venerated divine who penned them, they are also expressive of feelings which stir in thousands for whom the noble work which bears the name of John has been, if in varying manner, the revelation of a 'vision from another and diviner world.' Not, perhaps, the 'most interesting' of the records of the Life of Jesus, it is widely regarded as 'the favourite Gospel'; as Luther puts it: 'chiefest of the Gospels, unique, tender, and true[2].' Herein Luther is in full agreement with Augustine: 'in the four Gospels, or rather the four books of the one Gospel, St John the Apostle, not unworthily in respect of spiritual intelligence compared to the eagle, hath taken a higher flight, and soared in his preaching much more sublimely than the other three, and in the lifting up thereof would have our hearts lifted up likewise[3].' In short, there is large and ungrudging witness to the 'tender and unearthly beauty[4]' which pervades the often well-worn pages of the Johannine Gospel.

[1] Dale, *The Living Christ*, pp. 42, 46 f.

[2] 'Das einzige zarte rechte Haupt-Evangelium'; Werke, Erlangen, 1854, lxiii, p. 115. Oberhey (*Der Gottesbrunnen der Menschheit*, p. v) alludes to it as 'Des Neuen Testamentes Allerheiligstes.' And see the famous quotation from the *Wandsbecker Bote* (given at length by P. Ewald, *NKZ*, xix, 1908, pp. 825 f.): 'Am liebsten aber les' ich im Skt. Johannes &c.'

[3] On St John, *Hom.* xxxvi.

[4] Drummond, *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 2

But it is safe to say that, of those by whom that Gospel is treasured as a hallowed thing, there are numbers who, approaching it and studying it with pre-conceived opinions and with fixed beliefs, are either unaware of, or prefer to shut their eyes and ears to, the grave difficulties which it presents. The Johannine problem, as it is called, has no real existence for such persons; as with the Japanese gentleman of Dr Dale's allusion so with them, they do not 'check their wonder and their awe' by vexing themselves with questions relating to the authorship and historicity of what is so dear to them as a sacred, a plenarily inspired, book. Accounting it the absolutely true narrative of discourse and incident, they make no room for doubt that it comes down to them from him who figures in it as the Beloved Disciple. Its title is decisive for them, 'The Gospel according to St John.' And in these and the like prepossessions and convictions they are, undoubtedly, representative of, and can appeal to, a belief which stretches back through long centuries to a far-distant past. 'No Gospel comes to us with stronger external evidence of its acceptance by the Church[1]' than does this Gospel: its familiar title preserves the very name borne by it immediately on its appearance in literature as the not only used but formally adopted work[2]; when, towards the end of the second century, the four Gospels emerge into the clear light of day this Gospel is one of them, and its authority is 'recognized as undoubtingly and unhesitatingly as that of the other three[3].' A few early dissentients are met with; otherwise its Johannine authorship is assumed: 'the belief handed down that, in his old age, the Apostle John, the son of Zebedee, wrote his Gospel as a last testament to the Church[4],' and that what it contained was a true narrative, went for a long time unchallenged, and 'ecclesiastical tradition has never assigned' the Gospel which bears John's name 'to anyone but the Apostle John[5].'

Yet a day came when the gauntlet was thrown down boldly to traditional and conventional belief. As the situation (it still ob-

[1] J. Armitage Robinson, *Study of the Gospels*, p. 113.
[2] O. Holtzmann, *Das Evang. des Joh.* p. 115.
[3] Stanton, *GHD*, i, p. 162.
[4] Jülicher, *Einl.* p. 361.
[5] Soltau, *op. cit.* p. 103.

tains) has been stated within recent times: 'no book of the New Testament has met with more sharply opposed criticism, nor in respect of the true estimate of any other has there been so fierce a conflict between love and hate.' What, it is asked, is the true nature of the Fourth Gospel? Is it a trustworthy record of the events it purports to relate? Must it, on the other hand, be regarded as 'an epic or a drama or a theological tractate[1]' if strictly historical it be not? A 'unique book' and to be approached 'with no ordinary reverence'; 'the time is past,' it is quickly added, 'when we can accept without a shade of misgiving the tradition of its authorship, and delight ourselves without a question in its narratives[2].' Misgiving there is, and misgiving there must be; if questions be unavoidable, it is because, raised by the Gospel itself, they stare every honest student in the face.

To go back to the last decade of the eighteenth century. Although the start with Fourth Gospel criticism really began in England towards the close of the seventeenth century[3], it was not until the year 1792 that it was bluntly asked, by an English clergyman, 'how any kind of delusion should have induced creatures endowed with reason so long to have received it (*sc.* the Fourth Gospel) as the word of truth and the work of an Apostle of Jesus Christ[4].' Before long, in Germany, more hostile voices were raised, and with diversity of conjecture and hypothesis; one suggestion pointed to a genuine work of the Apostle with abundant supplementary matter by a later hand[5]; it was said that the real author

[1] Heinrici, *Der litterar. Charakter der neutest. Schriften*, p. 48.

[2] Drummond. *op. cit.* pp. 1 f.

[3] 'De eerste kritische twijfel openbaarde zich in Engeland, waarschijnlijk van de zijde der engelsche deïsten, eerst aan het einde der 17de eeuw.' Scholten, *Het Evan. naar Joh.* p. 24. And see Clericus (Hammond, *Novum Test.... cum paraphrasi et adnotationibus*, 2nd ed., i, pp. 391, 395): Confutare etiam non sum adgressus novos *Alogos*, quorum scripta non vidi.... Idem hodie *Alogorum* imitatores....

Evanson, *Dissonance of the four commonly received Gospels*, p. 226. The 'shallow criticism,' as Luthardt called it, if of a particular passage, is generally significant of both the position and the manner of the sometime Vicar of Tewkesbury. His criticism was, no doubt, crude and marred by coarseness of expression, yet justice should be done to him as a pioneer.

[5] Eckermann (1796). Vogel (1801) cited the Evangelist to the divine tribunal.

of the Gospel was an Alexandrian Christian[1] or a disciple of the Apostle John[2]. With firmer grasp and fuller statement of the Johannine problem in its many ramifications[3] it was held incredible that the Gospel should have come from an Apostle's pen; and, albeit the scholar who thus confidently argued made show of retreating from his position[4] and controversy for the time being slumbered, it is none the less the case that the questions shrewdly raised by him in detail have appeared but to reappear in that Fourth Gospel criticism which since his day has grown into a 'mighty stream,' and a mass of literature[5] affords ample proof that 'the problem of the Fourth Gospel is still the most unsettled, the most living, the most sensitive in all the field of introduction[6],' 'the cardinal inquiry, not merely of all New Testament criticism, but even of Christology[7].' The delicacy and intricacy of the problem is generally admitted; as might be expected, there is wide divergence of view; the pleas vigorously raised in some quarters on behalf of traditional authorship and historicity are elsewhere deemed invalid and are as vigorously disallowed. Yet on both sides there is a tendency to make concessions, while there is general agreement that, whatever else it be, John's Gospel is a noble and inspiring work. In more radical quarters it is said of it that, not by the Apostle and not what we moderns call history, it nevertheless leads back to Jesus, and that, if its theological vesture be worn threadbare, it scintillates with and awakens faith[8]; attributed to an author who 'remains unknown' and who had 'not witnessed the earthly life of Jesus except through the eyes of others,' 'the Gospel is the work of a great religious thinker who had entered profoundly into spiritual fellowship with Christ[9]'; 'while the author makes Jesus speak and act as the real Jesus never spoke and acted, yet in the discourses and the works so lent to him there

[1] Horst (1803). [2] Paulus (1821).

[3] Bretschneider, *Probabilia de evang. et epis. Joan. apos indole et origine.*

[4] Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Einl.* p. 697.

[5] No fewer than some 220 works on the Fourth Gospel are enumerated by Moffatt, *Introd. to N.T.* pp. 515 ff.

[6] Bacon, *Introd. to N.T.* p. 252.

[7] Luthardt, *St John's Gospel*, p. 3.

[8] Heitmüller, *SNT*, ii, p. 707.

[9] E. F. Scott, *Histor. and Relig. Value of the Fourth Gospel*, pp 17 f.

ceases not to be a living Christ[1].' As for the more conservative school of criticism, a relatively late date is readily admitted; an element of subjectivity; an 'apparent transference of the matured thought of the author to the lips of the speakers in his narrative[2]'; not a few, perhaps, would speak of 'an interpretation rather than a life[3],' and allow, nor yet of one section only in the Gospel, that 'it contains the reflections of the Evangelist, and is not a continuation of the words of the Lord[4]'; further, that, in the case of some of the Gospel contents, in respect at all events of detail, there is need of reservation. To revert, for a moment, to the former quarter; an earlier date is acquiesced in, and the terms 'pure romance' and 'down-right fiction' are more seldom heard or more guardedly used; here and there dependence on Apostolic notes and influences is allowed if it be held impossible to discover in the Evangelist St John himself. 'Even among those critics who regard the Gospel as concerned, on the whole, more with religious instruction than with historic accuracy, there are some who make the reservation that echoes of a true historic record are to be heard in it, so that it may be called a mixture of truth and poetry[5].'

Thus much by way of rapid survey of Fourth Gospel research in its inception and its earlier stages, of the situation as it exists at the present day[6]. In the following pages we will attempt some discussion of the problems which confront the serious and open-minded student; and in the course thereof frequent resort shall be had to books which emanate from theological workshops both at home and abroad, nor need there be the slightest hesitation to include such as witness to the 'indefatigable industry, profound thought, conscientious love of knowledge' which are admittedly

[1] Loisy, *Quatrième Évang.* p. 119. From the closing sentences of a fine passage.

[2] J. Armitage Robinson, *Study of the Gospels*, pp. 114 f. See also Stevens, *Johan. Theology*, pp. ix ff.

[3] Cf. Bacon, *Introd. to N.T.* p. 252. [4] See Westcott on *Jn*, iii. 16 ff.

[5] Wendt, *St John's Gospel*, p. 3. See also Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 1–33; Holtzmann, *Einl.* p. 436 ff.

[6] For a more detailed survey the reader should consult Loisy, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, pp. 36 ff.; Scholten, *Het Evan. naar Joh.* pp. 24 ff. See also A. V. Green, *op. cit.* pp. 65 ff. Reference might also be made to Albert Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (Engl. tr. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*).

characteristic of German scholarship[1]. At the close of this chapter some remarks shall be ventured in the hope of reassuring those who, having read thus far, may imagine themselves not only robbed of their security in respect of 'John's' Gospel, but asked to sit fast and loose to what, in their conviction, are of the fundamentals of the Christian faith.

It was said to an earlier generation that 'the assailants of (the Fourth Gospel) are of two kinds: those who deny the miraculous element in Christianity, those who deny the distinctive character of Christian doctrine,' and that the Gospel 'confronts both[2].' There has been a moving on since then, with a consequent change of front; and now it would be widely allowed that such strong assertions, not altogether destitute of truth in certain cases, are by no means true all round. 'It is unjust to assume that those who question the authenticity of the Gospel according to St John are primarily impelled to do so by theological prepossession,' neither is it right to say that they are one and all prejudiced by 'its emphatic declaration of the divinity of Christ.' As a matter of fact 'there are many who are heartily devoted to that central truth, and yet cannot easily persuade themselves that the Fourth Gospel offers them history quite in the sense that the other Gospels do, cannot think that Christ spoke exactly as He is here represented as speaking, and consequently cannot feel assured that this is the record of an eye-witness, or, in other words, of the Apostle St John[3].' And here perhaps it might be put on record that the traditional authorship of the Gospel has found a staunch upholder in a distinguished Unitarian scholar and divine[4].

In anticipation of a comparison to be instituted later on be-

[1] Stanley, *Sermons on the Apos. Age.* To similar effect Sanday, *op. cit.* pp. 18 ff.; see also his recent pamphlet *In View of the End.* It is a pity that Mr Raven (*op. cit.* p. 105) should permit himself the sweeping generalization 'Teutonic unbelief.'

[2] Lightfoot, *Bibl. Essays*, p. 47. Cf. Düsterdieck, *Über das Evang. Joh.* p. 783.

[3] J. Armitage Robinson, *op. cit.* pp. 133, 113 f., 118; J. H. Bernard, Paper read at the Bristol (1903) Church Congress.

[4] The allusion is to Dr Drummond, sometime Principal of Manchester College, Oxford. See Sanday, *op. cit.* p. 32.

tween 'John' and the 'other Gospels,' the following well-weighed words shall find a place here:

> 'The authors of our first three Gospels, in giving, or at all events professing to give, a simple narrative of incident and teaching, and reporting the impression which Jesus made on the first generations of disciples, show us a person with a double consciousness; to whom the Divine communion He enjoyed was as real as the human life He lived[1].'

There is nevertheless 'the problem of the Person of Christ[2].'

[1] Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius*, p. x. And thus Ammon (*Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, publ. 1842, i, p. 82): 'In jedem Falle aber ist es ungegründet, dass in den drei ersten Evangelien die höhere Natur Jesu übersehen und vernachlässigt worden sei.' It might be said perhaps of the 'Hat Jesus gelebt?' controversy (the echoes which have passed from Germany into England) that it has forced a recognition that behind the human Jesus of the Synoptic representation there stands One who is conceived of as more than mere man.

[2] Cf. A. W. Robinson, *Are we making progress?* p. 19.

CHAPTER II

APPROXIMATE DATE OF THE GOSPEL

With a change of outlook for the Early Church[1] and a growing consciousness of new needs[2] a demand sprang up for records of the earthly life of Jesus, and hence the birth of a distinctively Christian literature[3]. In other words, men started on the composition of 'books'; and these in course of time were designated by a term which, passing from its original meaning[4], was used in the first instance of the oral message and then of the document wherein the 'glad tidings' was contained: the 'One Gospel'—as set forth by the several pen-men; 'the Gospels,' their respective works. And there is abundant proof of much industrious activity, at a very early period, in the new field. The allusion Lk. i, 1 ff. is significant; and, although the word 'many' does not necessarily imply an extensive library, it would scarcely have been used by the Evangelist had but some two or three sources only have been at his command. Other evidence is available; and it consists, not in 'Christian romances' which belong to a somewhat later day, but in fragments of writings approximately near in date to the Canonical Gospels, together with possible allusions to one not otherwise known. It may accordingly be said of the Canonical Gospels that they are really specimens of a type or class of literature which, highly popular, spread far and wide.

A time came when the four Bible Gospels—the 'holy quatei-

[1] A realization that the 'Coming of the Lord' might be delayed, cf. 2 Pet. iii, 8 ff. Here and in some following paragraphs I have ventured to draw on a paper (on the Synoptic Problem) contributed by me to *CBE*.

[2] By reason of (i) the dying off of men who had seen and known Jesus, and (ii) the spread of the new religion.

[3] As distinguished from correspondence; the occasional writings known as 'Epistles.'

[4] εὐαγγέλιον, the reward given to the bearer of good tidings. See Jülicher, *Einl.* p. 252.

nion' of Eusebius—were fenced off as it were from other writings of the same family, 'canonized.' To mark off separate stages in the process is impossible; no express information is forthcoming, and it is a right view which suggests that the 'canonization' of all the New Testament writings was the issue of an unconscious growth. That no special sanctity attached at the outset to the Gospels is clear both from the attitude of Evangelist to Evangelist[1], and also from the fact that when Tatian substituted his Diatessaron for them in all good faith exception was not taken to his action or to the 'harmony' which of course witnessed to an importance they already possessed. How precisely it came about that four Gospels were singled out from the rest, placed side by side, accounted authoritative and sacred, is not fully known; what can be said is that, as time went on, 'the caskets which enshrined the jewel of traditions concerning Jesus were identified with the jewel itself'; and, if the completion of the New Testament Canon as a whole cannot be dated earlier than the close of the Fourth century (in the case of Eastern churches somewhat later), it is certain that the Gospels had long before attained a position of supremacy in by far the larger part of the Christendom of the age. For Irenaeus they are 'Holy Scripture,' and he gives fanciful reasons as to why they are precisely four in number[2].

Or to put it thus: the 'many' Gospels in circulation had been subjected to such tests as the critical acumen and spiritual insight of the day could apply; by degrees the superiority of some and the inferiority of others was determined; in the event four and four only were deemed worthy to survive, and they, the Canonical Gospels, remained masters of the field[3].

They did not invariably stand in the to us accustomed order. No fewer than seven different arrangements have been reckoned up, of which two only however appear to have been at all widespread; the sequence Matthew, John, Luke, Mark[4], and the more generally favoured sequence of the ordinary Bible[5]. These two

[1] To wit, the free handling of our Second Gospel by the First and Third Evangelists.

[2] Euseb. *HE*, v. 8.

[3] Ecclesia quatuor habet evangelia, haereses plurima (Origen).

[4] So in the Monarchian Prologues.

[5] The order which obtains in the Muratorian Canon.

arrangements, it is suggested, are alike significant; in the former case of values placed on the respective Gospels—those attributed to Apostles ranking above those attributed to disciples of the Apostles; the more familiar sequence being based on chronological principle, John regarded as last and Matthew first in order of composition[1]. As for the titles of the Gospels; in the earliest MSS. one general title, ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ, covers the four, the separate books being simply headed ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ and so forth. These titles are not to be assigned to the authors themselves; they were prefixed by others, and probably date from the period when the four Gospels were so collected together as to form one whole. And it is a safe assumption that those who prefixed them regarded, and meant to indicate, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John as authors of the Gospels so named[2]. Whether the verdict thus pronounced was well founded is quite another matter, and it is the business of students of Christian history to apply modern and approved tests.

To turn from such preliminary considerations to our Gospel. While the first three Gospels are 'sister-works,' it stands, as all admit, in a distinct category, by itself apart, and not only because of its position in the Canon but for other reasons[3] it is more frequently termed the 'Fourth Gospel' in the diction of Biblical research. And the subject to be approached and provisionally determined in this chapter is one which hinges on the question of its approximate date.

There are two extreme limits beyond which there is no need to travel in our search.

First; in the eyes of Irenaeus all four Gospels are Holy Scripture. Judging from the manner of his allusions, the rank thus acquired by them, however gradually, had ceased to be a novelty in the period marked by his literary activities[4]; and the inference

[1] So Jülicher.

[2] The word *κατά* might mean 'as used by,' or 'as taught by,' or imply direct authorship. The latter meaning is the one to be adopted. See Volkmar (*Die Evangelien*, p. ix f.), who has some caustic remarks on the subject.

[3] To avoid committals in respect to authorship, etc.

[4] Irenaeus, a native of Asia Minor, was born *ca.* A.D. 135–142. He may have paid several visits to Rome, but the scene of his chief activities lay in Gaul; a presbyter of the Church of Lyons he became its Bishop *ca.* A.D. 178:

is safe that they had so ranked for some little time. 'John' was one of those Gospels. Whether it be the case or not that its attachment to the Synoptic group had been attended with hesitation, it could have been no very recent work when Irenaeus said his say. Nor is this all. Some years earlier, as it would appear, it had been already commented upon by Heracleon[1].

Hence the *terminus ad quem* can by no possibility be referred to a date later than the last decade but two of the second century.

In the second place. There is a strong consensus of opinion, at all events it is now widely allowed, that the Synoptic Gospels were known to, or known of by, the Fourth Evangelist[2]. The conclusion naturally follows that the *terminus a quo* for the composition of his own Gospel is the date assignable to the latest of the 'sister-works'; and accordingly, by reason of the admitted priority of Mark, the choice rests between the Matthaean and the Lucan Gospels.

What of their respective dates? 'The great authorities differ'; as for the First Gospel, there is no certainty whether as to authorship, locality or date; it may point to the close of the first century, or it may present features quite compatible with an earlier period; a cautious verdict finds much which, forbidding a date earlier than *ca.* A.D. 80, does 'not require one later than 100[3]'; between the

his death took place some ten or fifteen years later. One of his works (*Adv. Haer.*) is dated *ca.* A.D. 180–190.

[1] Probably the first to write a commentary on the Fourth Gospel. A native of Alexandria, he was a disciple of Valentinus, and flourished *ca.* A.D. 145–180. Bleek (*Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik*, p. 215) remarks: 'Die Erklärungen des Heracleon zeigen aufs deutlichste dass er das Evlgm. als eine in anerkanntem Ansehen stehende Schrift vorgefunden hat.' Cf. Stanton, *GHD*, i, p. 258; Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 17.

[2] *EB*, ii, col. 2540; Forbes, *The Johan. Literature*, p. 154; Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 60. Moffatt (*op. cit.* p. 534) writes: 'the only Gospel about which there need be any hesitation is that of Lk,' but (see p. 581) his hesitation is evidently slight, as well it may be. Schleiermacher (*Einl. ins N.T.* p. 317) found reasons why 'John' could not have known the Syn. Gospels. Calmes (*L'Évan. selon Saint-Jean*, p. 8) is doubtful in regard to literary dependence. See also Wendt, *Die Schichten im vierten Evglm.* p. 107. According to Cludius (*Uransichten des Christenthums*, pp. 61 f.) the Fourth Evangelist could not possibly have known Matthew. It is noteworthy that the Fourth Gospel was held by Semler (see Lange, *Das Evglm. Joh.* p. 26) to be the earliest of all the Gospels See also Schleiermacher, *Einl.* p. 331.

[3] McNeile, *St Matthew*, p. xxviii.

years '70 and 100' is about all that can be said[1]. In like manner with the Gospel which bears the name of Luke; it is held by not a few that 'the decade from A.D. 70 to A.D. 80 is the probable date[2],' or that there are grounds for preferring 'the intermediate date of A.D. 75–80[3].' Allowance must be made for some developement of Gospel literature, while, if the Third Evangelist had actually read Josephus[4], the first century would be nearing its end when he wrote.

The situation is precarious. It would appear that refuge must be taken in an 'either—or.' If the *terminus a quo* does not lie within the decade A.D. 70–80, it cannot well be pushed back earlier than A.D. 95; and indeed *ca.* A.D. 95–100 might be nearer the mark.

Let us now cast about for such evidence as may go near, if not all the way, to suggest a date later than to which the composition of the Fourth Gospel cannot be referred.

An appeal, it may be, lies to the second Petrine Epistle; which, not by St Peter, is, according to a recent conjecture, a composite work wherein are embedded genuine Apostolic fragments[5]. Here attention is arrested by the statement 2 Pet. i, 14, it being, in any case, strongly reminiscent of Jn xxi, 18 ff.[6]; but the question may, of course, be of mere coincidence or of independent allusion to accomplished fact. Yet a possibility remains that an unknown author who wrote *ca.* A.D. 160–175[7] was leaning on the Fourth Gospel.

The region for search now lies outside the Canon of the New Testament.

[1] J. Weiss, *SNT*, i, p. 230.

[2] Adeney, St Luke (*CB*), p. 32.

[3] Plummer, *St Luke*, p. xxxi.

[4] Burkitt, *Gosp. Hist.* pp. 105 ff.; Forbes, *op. cit.* p. 164.

[5] E. Iliff Robson, *Studies in 2nd Ep. of St Peter.*

[6] De Wette, *Lehrbuch der histor.-krit. Einl. in die kanon. Bücher des N.T.* p. 225. But see Schenkel, *Das Charakterbild Jesu*, p. 250. Remarking on 1 Pet. i, 19; Jn i, 29, P Ewald (*Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, p. 70) discovers 'Johanneische Materialien im ersten Petrusbriefe.'

[7] So Harnack. With others the date ranges between A.D. 100 and A.D. 175. According to Hollmann (*SNT*, ii, p. 574) 2nd Pet. is the latest of all the N.T. writings.

Passing reference may be made to the little sect nick-named by Epiphanius the Alogi. They will be heard of again; the point here is that *ca.* A.D. 175—'or possibly ten years or so earlier'—they testify to the existence of the Fourth Gospel, if in such a way as to show that its authority 'was as yet not firmly established[1].' The fact that they could assign its authorship to Cerinthus is perhaps significant of a work of by no means recent composition.

Are hints forthcoming from the so-called Second Epistle of Clement—'no letter but a homily'—which, originating possibly at Rome or Corinth, is assigned to the period A.D. 120–140 or 150[2]? There is similarity of idea as to the Incarnation, with phraseology held to be at least suggestive of the Prologue (Jn i, 1 ff.) of the Fourth Gospel[3]. Yet dependence is not proved; and perhaps the facts of the case are fairly satisfied by the hypothesis that the 'pseudo-Clement had resort to a source fusing the forms found in Luke and Matthew' 'with such additions as made it correspond more completely to the notion of Christ's Gospel[4].'

To turn to the Shepherd of Hermas. The work of a single author who, it may be, spent five years and upwards in its composition, it seems to have made its appearance somewhere in the decade A.D. 130–140; turns and phrases are met with in it to which at first sight there appear to be definite parallels in the Johannine Gospel. A Johannine colouring may be admitted; but whether occasional coincidence or similarity of figure or expression be conclusive for direct literary connexion is doubtful; and, albeit four Gospels are perhaps symbolized by the 'bench with four feet' (*Vis.* iii, 13) and 'four ranks in the foundation of the tower' (*Sim.* ix, 4) of which Hermas tells, it does not follow that he is a witness to the Fourth Gospel itself.

The case is scarcely otherwise with the remarkable work which, discovered in a library at Constantinople by Bishop Bryennios,

[1] Stanton, *op. cit.* i, p. 210. The whole section dealing with the Alogi should be read. See also Loisy, *op. cit.* pp. 18 ff.

[2] *RGG*, i, col. 553.

[3] See Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 3.

[4] *NTAF* (Oxf. Soc. of Hist. Theology) p. 125. The reader is advised to consult this work; it is laid under contribution in regard to the writings now under consideration.

was published in 1883; the *Didache*, The Teaching of The Twelve Apostles. There is however, wide diversity of opinion in respect of date; and if it be a relatively late work[1], it ceases to be of value in the present search. Nor does the evidence forthcoming from it go for much; the figure of the vine (*Did.* ix, 2) is but slightly reminiscent of Jn xv, 1; 'the point of closest resemblance is that the *Didache*, like the Fourth Gospel, does not connect the spiritual food with the specific ideas of the institution' of the Eucharist.

Neither is there any sure guidance in the Epistle which, probably originating in Egypt, bears the name of Barnabas; for, whether of relatively early date or not—A.D. 100–140, or A.D. 70–100[2]—the connecting links are few, and at most such as to suggest a phraseology not so much borrowed as already current coin.

Johannine resemblances are certainly met with in the Epistle addressed to the Corinthians by Clement of Rome, but they hardly prove dependence, and a probability must be reckoned with that, when Clement wrote, *ca.* A.D. 95 or 96, the Fourth Gospel had not yet come into existence[3].

We now question Justin Martyr[4]. In the crucial passage express mention is made by him of 'memoirs' compiled by Christ's Apostles and those who companioned with them[5]; and, although the hypothesis has been advanced[6] that, not without knowledge of the Canonical Gospels, Justin really used a single work, the reference is best accounted for by the supposition that the 'memoirs' were none other than the works which bear the names of the Apostles

[1] Harnack places it between A.D. 130 and A.D. 160; Knopf (*RGG*, i, col. 553) extends the limits from A.D. 90 to A.D. 150.

[2] *RGG*, i, col. 552.

[3] Calmes (*op. cit.* pp. 49 ff.) argues for the dependence of Clem. Rom. on the Fourth Gospel.

[4] His birthplace Sychem and of Greek parentage, Justin (refusing to discard his philosopher's cloak) became a convert at the age of thirty, and gained renown for his vigorous defence of Christianity against the pagans. He was beheaded at Rome about the year A.D. 165 His extant writings consist of two Apologies and a Dialogue with Trypho the Jew.

[5] *Dial.* 103: *ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι ἃ φημι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντετάχθαι.*

[6] E.g. by Credner. See Stanton, *op. cit.* pp. 76 ff., on the whole question. Also Ezra Abbott, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 16 ff.

Matthew and John and of the disciples of Apostles viz. Mark and Luke[1]. Justin's Christology is essentially Johannine; it is true that he nowhere expressly names the Fourth Gospel, but there is, in the eyes of many, amply sufficient evidence that it was not only known to him but actually used[2]. The assumption accordingly is that, by the year A.D. 161[3] at the very latest, our Gospel was already well known, while perhaps not as yet ranked with the Synoptics.

It may be that Justin both knew and used the docetic Gospel which, bearing the name of Peter[4], enjoyed popularity (*ca.* A.D. 200) at Rhossus in Cilicia and justly excited the suspicions of Serapion[5]. In it there appear to be points of contact[6] which suggest that the Fourth Gospel was known to, and very freely handled by, the docetist writer whose work, if really used by Justin, cannot be later than *ca.* A.D. 150, while it may stretch as far back as A.D. 130[7]. If such be really the case the heretical work would become a relatively early witness to the existence of our Gospel.

Whether our Gospel was actually known to Papias[8] is a moot point, and as his name will come up in another connexion, no appeal shall be made now to the Bishop of Hierapolis. Nor will it serve the immediate purpose to instance Polycarp[9]; he too will be referred to later on, and here it shall suffice to say that no conclusive proof of dependence is discovered in the Epistle addressed by him to the Philippians. Opinion differs in regard to Ignatius[10];

[1] *EB*, i, col. 677. According to Lützelberger (*Die Kirchl. Tradition über den Apos. Joh.* p. 250) Justin's four Gospels were Mt.. Mk, Lk. and Peter = Hebr.

[2] Loisy, *op. cit.* pp. 14 f.; Heitmüller, *SNT*, ii, p. 709. Otherwise Schwegler, *Der Montanismus und die christl. Kirche*, p. 184.

[3] So Stanton, and see Calmes, *op. cit.* pp. 26 ff.

[4] See Rendel Harris, *Newly-recovered Gospel of Peter.*

[5] Euseb. *HE*, vi, 12. [6] Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 15 f. [7] *RGG*, i, col. 547.

[8] Flourished *ca.* A.D. 70 (80) 140. W. Bauer (*HBNT*, II, ii, p. 5) regards it as probable that he knew our Gospel. Larfeld (*Die beiden Johannes von Ephesus*, p 185) refuses to admit of any doubt. Heitmüller (*SNT*, ii, p. 709) wisely contents himself with a 'perhaps.' Schleiermacher (*op. cit.* p. 243) advanced grounds which made it clear to him that Papias did not know 'John.'

Bishop of Smyrna. The date of his martyrdom is placed by Eusebius (*HE*, iv, 15) *ca.* A.D. 166.

[10] Bishop of Antioch, martyred at Rome during the reign of Trajan. His

on the one hand it is urged that, in his Christology, he is dependent on 'John[1],' on the other hand flat negations come as a matter of course from quarters where the Gospel is relegated to a long subsequent date. More cautiously is it said that its use by the martyr, if highly probable, falls some way short of certainty, and prudence might be content to note features which are highly suggestive of 'the Johannine world of thought and phrase[2].'

But that the beautiful Epistle to Diognetus[3] is an unsolved riddle in respect of writer and addressee, of locality and date, it might be summoned as an earlier witness inasmuch as Johannine notes ring out in it, and, were we to take its accomplished author at his word ('a disciple of the Apostles'), the conclusion might follow that it was composed in the reign of Trajan. The possibility is, however, that it originated in a considerably later period[4].

The name of Heracleon, already instanced, now points us, if only for a moment, to his predecessors in those great movements of thought which, more or less tinged with Christian ideas, culminated in the 'boldest and grandest Syncretism the world had ever beheld[5]'; but, as the question of Gnosticism will be discussed later, it may suffice to remark here that adequate ground is discovered for the belief that *ca.* A.D. 135 'John's' Gospel was highly esteemed by Basilides[6] and was well known to the Valentinians[7], if doubt arises in the case of the master himself[8].

genuine Epistles (Shorter Greek recension) are dated within the years A.D. 109–116. Harnack (*Chron.* i, p. 719) writes: '110–117; perhaps, but improbably, a few years later.'

[1] Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 6. To the same effect Lightfoot, Zahn and others.

[2] Wendt, *op. cit.* pp. 176 f. Indications of the use by Ignatius do not seem to Stanton (*op. cit.* i, p. 19) 'to be altogether wanting, although they are not so full and clear as might have been expected.' Bardsley (*JTS*, xiv, pp. 207 f.) writes with greater confidence. On the other hand Schwegler (*op. cit.* p. 159) writes: 'die Verfasser der ignatian. Briefe tragen jene Lehre (*sc.* die Logoslehre) ohne, wie es scheint, das Johan. Evglm. zu kennen, bereits in ziemlich ausgebildeter Gestalt vor.'

[3] First printed by H. Stephens in 1592, the one then extant MS. perished at Strasburg in the Franco German War. A transcript (made by Stephens) is preserved at Leyden.

[4] Bardenhewer prefers to think of the third century.

[5] Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.* i, p. 99.

(For notes 6–8 see p. 17.)

At this point we will pause in our search; and content ourselves, for the time being, with setting down such provisional conclusions as appear to be suggested by an inquiry which has not stepped outside the field of external evidence.

First in respect of a *terminus ad quem*. The question is not altogether easy to decide; for, in the case of certain Apostolic fathers, coincidence of idea and phrase is not in itself proof of actual acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel, while documents otherwise temptingly suggestive must be ruled out by reason of their obscure origination. This, at all events, appears certain; the extreme limit which points to the days of Irenaeus may be pushed back by several decades. The question then is: how much further back? An answer comes with the recognition that, albeit 'the first reliable traces of the existence of the Fourth Gospel are found in the Apology of Justin Martyr[1],' there is warrant for the assumption of its use 'in the circles of Valentinian Gnosis[2].'

The provisional *terminus ad quem*, accordingly, lies somewhere about the year A.D. 135.

Secondly. The question of the *terminus a quo* is encompassed with difficulty, in that it is contingent on the dating of the First and Third Gospels. It may, on the one hand, be discovered in the years *ca.* A.D. 75–80; on the other hand it may not be earlier than the close of the first century. At this stage no further word is possible.

In due course the Fourth Gospel will be itself questioned, and its approximate date more nearly determined from internal evidence presented by it, the tone and tenor of its contents. But it must be our first business to go into the question of its authorship in venerable tradition.

[6] Basilides flourished ca. A.D. 117–138. About all that is known of him is that he taught at Alexandria, perhaps also at Antioch and in Persia. His teaching survives mainly in allusions by his opponents, e.g. Clem. Alex.; of his *Exegetica* but fragments are extant.

[7] See on the whole question Scott-Moncrieff, *St John Apos. Evang. and Prophet*, pp. 240 ff.; also Stanton, *op. cit.* i, pp. 64 ff. (Basilides), pp 69, 205 (Valentinus).

[8] 'Ob der Meister der Schule es gekannt hat ist fraglich,' W. Bauer, *HBNT*, II, ii, p. 5.

[1] Heitmüller, *SNT*, ii, p. 709. [2] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 581.

CHAPTER III

AUTHORSHIP IN TRADITION

'The evidences which reach back to disciples of disciples of St John, even to St John himself, who repeatedly affirms it in his Gospel, demonstrate that that Gospel was written by that very same Apostle[1].'

So runs the verdict which, with much show of plausibility and prolific diatribe against 'self-styled critics,' amounts to a triumphant *cadit quaestio* in regard to the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. Pronounced by a writer who, pledged—it would seem—to the defence, is evidently well content to exercise the combined functions of counsel, jury-man, and judge, its unhesitating acceptance in the circles immediately addressed by him is a foregone conclusion. Yet such will scarcely be the case in other quarters; nor will open-minded students be slow to realize that the situation is far more complicated than he allows it to be supposed.

In like manner as in the preceding chapter, the question of authorship shall, at this stage, be discussed with exclusive reference to external evidence[2]; and with the recognition that any decisive word—if such a word be possible—must be spoken by the Gospel itself[3].

There is no doubt whatsoever that upholders of the 'orthodox opinion' (there are, be it said, 'critics' among them) have the strong support of two illustrious personages, Eusebius and Origen, and they shall be questioned in the first instance.

To begin with Eusebius[4]. This writer entertains no doubt that

[1] Polidori, *I Nostri Quattro Evangelii*, p. 246. With the like confidence H. H. Evans (*St John the author of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 84, 99).

[2] Polidori's assertion points to internal as well as to external evidence.

[3] Cf. Wernle, *Quellen*, pp. 9, 11.

[4] Bishop of Caesarea, A.D. 314–340. The pupil and the friend of scholars, he was himself possessed of extensive learning; and, a great traveller, he had

he who, returning from his island-exile, governed the Churches in Asia, and continued to reside in Ephesus until the days of Trajan, was John, Apostle and Evangelist, the disciple whom Jesus loved[1]. Discoursing on the order of the Gospels[2], he starts off with an allusion to the undisputed writings of the same Apostle[3]; of these, says he, the Gospel, so well known in all the Churches under heaven, must be acknowledged at the first; then, explaining why John's Gospel stands last in order of sequence, he treats of those previously published by Matthew, Mark and Luke. What follows from him is to the following effect: John, they say, having all his time preached but not using his pen, in the end set himself to write. The occasion was this: on the three earlier Gospels being handed to him, he, they say, admitted them and testified to their truth, albeit they were therein defective that the earlier stages of the ministry were absent from their accounts. Such, says Eusebius, was the fact; and, the omissions being specified by him, he thus proceeds: for these reasons, the Apostle John, they say, being entreated to undertake the task, wrote an account of the period not touched on by the other Evangelists and of doings of the Saviour which they had omitted to record. With dismissal of arguments advanced by some that the Gospels were at variance, and with some remarks on John's additions and John's silence on the genealogy of the Lord, Eusebius adds: thus much about the Gospel according to John.

Such, in substance, is the testimony of the Bishop of Caesarea. Two things may be inferred from it; to begin with, he himself is fully persuaded that, however the case might stand with the two smaller Epistles and the Apocalypse, the author of the Fourth Gospel (and of the First Epistle) is John the Apostle and Beloved Disciple. And next: the reiterated 'they say' is significant of de-

frequent opportunities of converse with famous persons. He was well versed in the beliefs and opinions current in his age. His industry as a historian is conspicuous, if his style be somewhat prosaic and there be lack of system in the arrangement of his matter.

[1] *HE*, iii, 23. [2] *Ibid.* iii, 24.

[3] The Gospel and the First Epistle. Eusebius adds that the two smaller Epistles were in dispute, and that with regard to the Apocalypse there was difference of opinion.

pendence; the inference here is that Eusebius, having consulted such authorities as were at his command, finds a strong consensus of opinion to warrant his belief[1].

Eusebius was, no doubt, abreast of his times and indefatigable in research[2]. He records what, to the best of his judgement, was ascertained fact; yet his critical judgement might be at fault, for, however conscientious and painstaking he might be, his methods and his tests were, after all, those of his own day, and a wide gulf lies between him and historians of the modern world. Accordingly it cannot be allowed off-hand that the traditional authorship of the Gospel is finally established by what he set down in all good faith.

As for Origen[3], his belief was to the like effect. In the first of the many books of his great commentary on our Gospel, he places it last in order of sequence; in the fifth book he writes: What must be said of him, John, who reclined on Jesus' breast? He who has left one Gospel, with the avowal that he could write far more than the world itself could contain[4]. By 'John' Origen certainly means the Apostle John; and we may note in passing that he refers both the Gospel and the Apocalypse to the same pen.

It will be observed that Eusebius appeals to Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria[5]; and to Irenaeus and, if with some delay, to Clement, inquiry shall now turn.

Irenaeus. What this Father says about the Gospels is, in substance, this: Matthew produced his Gospel among the Hebrews, and in their dialect, while Peter and Paul were evangelizing and

[1] 'An individual might make a mistake about the authorship of a book, but could a whole community?' Mackay, *A Reasonable Faith*, p. 106. Yet beliefs do grow up on a very slight basis of fact, not to say without any basis at all.

[2] Eusebius 'las gründlich'; Harnack, *Chron.* i, p. 657. Cf. Schwartz, *Über den Tod der Söhne Zeb.* p. 22.

[3] Origen (A.D. 185–254) was born at Alexandria. The pupil of Clement, he had visited Rome; he laboured in Arabia; some years were spent by him at Antioch; when on the way to Greece he passed through Palestine. A profound thinker, his literary activity was vast; and Raven's panegyric (*op. cit.* pp. 74 f.) is richly deserved by one who, in the eyes of pagans and Christians, was 'a miracle of scholarship.'

[4] Euseb. *HE*, vi, 25. Cf. Jn xxi, 25.

[5] *HE*, iii, 23.

laying the foundations of the Church in Rome. They being deceased, Mark, disciple and interpreter of Peter, also handed down to us in writing things which Peter had preached. Luke, Paul's companion, set forth in his book the Gospel as it had been proclaimed by Paul. Thereafter John, the disciple of the Lord, who lay on his breast, he too gave forth the Gospel while he yet abode at Ephesus in Asia[1]. And again: And all the elders, they of Asia who had conferred with John the disciple of the Lord, bear witness that (their tradition) had been delivered to them by John, for he remained on with them until the days of Trajan[2]. And again, writing to Florinus[3], Irenaeus goes back to the days of his own boyhood as one who has better remembrance of events belonging to the past than of those of recent times; I can tell, says he, the very place where sat and taught blessed Polycarp[4], and how Polycarp spoke of intercourse had by him with John, and of what he had heard from others who had seen the Lord.

For Irenaeus, it will be remembered, the Fourth Gospel, like its three companions, was Holy Scripture. It was assigned by him to the Apostle John; and that in the first of the above citations, as elsewhere, he is really alluding to the son of Zebedee is not open to doubt and is indeed generally admitted[5]. This John, it will be remarked further, is identified by Irenaeus with the Beloved Disciple; yet what he does not do is expressly to designate him the Apostle.

Leaving Irenaeus for the moment, but not as yet turning to Clement, we will pause here for some allusion to the Alogi, to the Monarchian Prologue to the Gospel, and to the Muratorian Canon.

It has been said already that the Fourth Gospel was attributed to the heretic Cerinthus by the little sect or *coterie* to which Epiphanius gave the nick-name of Alogi. Let us remark now that,

[1] Euseb. *HE*, v, 8. [2] *Ibid.* iii, 23.

[3] In his Epistle περὶ μοναρχίας. Euseb. v, 20. Florinus was a Roman presbyter. The genuineness of this Epistle is disputed by Scholten, *Der Apos. Joh. in Kleinasien* (from the Dutch, by Spiegel), p. 68.

[4] Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, was martyred *ca.* A.D. 166 in the reign of Marcus Aurelius.

[5] See Harnack, *Chron.* i, p. 657; Scholten, *op. cit.* p. 42; Jülicher, *Einl.* p. 362; Stanton, *op. cit.* i, p. 213; Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 25; Gutjahr, *Glaubwürdigkeit*, p. 3.

belonging to the period in which Irenaeus flourished, their theory of the origination of the Fourth Gospel was controverted by Irenaeus himself; yet further, that the home of the Alogi was in Asia Minor. The strange thing, then is that they could flatly deny its Apostolic authorship in the very region to which its authorship was assigned; and the question necessarily arises whether any conclusive proof that its author was none other than the Apostle John could have been actually at hand at the time[1].

Leaving the Alogi, we turn to the Monarchian Prologue to the Gospel. Together with its companion Prologues it has been assigned to the first third of the third century, and, revealing features characteristic of the Monarchian tendency[2], it is less concerned with the contents than with the alleged author of our Gospel. Therein it is stated: John the Evangelist, one of the disciples of God, by God chosen to be Virgin...he wrote this Gospel in Asia, after he had written the Apocalypse in the Isle of Patmos. The romantic story follows which tells how, knowing that the time of his departure was at hand, John gathered his Ephesian disciples round him and descended into his tomb. The point to observe is that, referred to as Evangelist and Disciple, he is not expressly designated the Apostle John.

Again passing on, we take next the Muratorian Canon[3]. A mere fragment, with nothing in it which exactly determines its date, locality or authorship, written in barbarous Latin and evidently a version from a Greek original, it is held to have originated in the West, perhaps at Rome, towards the close of the second century, or, it may be, a few years later[4]. The opening sentences evidently referred to Mark; a statement is made as to Luke; the fourth place is given to John's Gospel and there is an account of the circumstances in which it was composed: 'At the entreaties of his fellow

[1] The point has been raised by Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 21. 'The Alogi would scarcely have ventured on such a denial of Joh. authorship in the face of a fixed and certain tradition,' Forbes, *op. cit.* p. 168.

[2] On the Monarchian Prologues, see Corssen, *TU.* xv, p. 1.

[3] First published 1740 by Muratori, Librarian at Milan; hence its name. For the text see Lietzmann, *Kleine Texte*, i.

[4] *EB*, i, col. 679; Westcott, *Canon of N.T.* pp. 190 f. The passage as cited is from Westcott's translation.

disciples and his bishops, John, one of the disciples, said: Fast with me for three days from this time, and whatsoever shall be revealed to each of us (whether it be favourable to my writing or not) let us relate it to one another. On the same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the Apostles, that John should relate all things in his own name, aided by the revision of all.... What wonder is it then that John so constantly brings forward Gospel-phrases even in his Epistles, saying in his own person, what we have seen with our eyes and heard with our ears and our hands have handled, these things have we written? For so he professes that he was not only an eye-witness, but also a hearer, and moreover a historian of all the wonderful works of the Lord.' So runs the legendary tale which is perhaps itself based on some more highly elaborated romance[1]; what, to all appearance, does it suggest? It might be said, in the first place, that, albeit placed last in order of sequence, John's Gospel is apparently referred to a period earlier than the Synoptics. John, it might be said next, is differentiated, as a disciple, from certain Apostles of whom Andrew is one. The inference, again, is that his Gospel is not exclusively his own independent work. A further conjecture might be that the locality of composition is transferred from Ephesus to Palestine. Speaking generally, an impression is conveyed that accurate knowledge relative to the origination of the Fourth Gospel was not available for the Church at Rome.

The points thus far raised being each one borne in mind, our attention is now claimed by Clement of Alexandria[2].

In one of Clement's works some account is given by him of all the Canonical Scriptures; and the tradition as to the order of the Gospels which, derived by him from primitive elders, he hands down is to the following effect: those which contain the genealogies

[1] Corssen, *op. cit.* p. 103. Calmes (*op. cit.* p. 36, note) writes: 'Le fragment de Murat. dépend des *Acta Petri*. Or ce dernier livre parait être du même auteur que les *Acta Jo.*' And see Scholten, *op. cit.* p. 82.

[2] The date of Clement's birth is uncertain; his death took place *ca.* A.D. 200, and accordingly he would be very nearly contemporaneous with Irenaeus. In earlier life a learned pagan philosopher, he had travelled widely in the pursuit of knowledge. Becoming a convert at Alexandria, all his energies were thereafter devoted to the promotion, both by discourse and writing, of the Church's cause.

(viz. Mt. and Lk.) were written first; Mark, at the request of many who had heard Peter at Rome, composed his Gospel, Peter neither encouraging nor hindering him; John, last of all, perceiving that what had reference to corporeal things (*τὰ σωματικὰ*) in the Gospel of our Saviour was sufficiently related, encouraged by his friends and inspired by the Spirit, wrote a spiritual (*πνευματικὸν*) Gospel[1].

So, then, the Marcan Gospel (as at that day was to be expected) is not prior to Mt. and Lk. in the eyes of Clement. In disagreement with Irenaeus, he refers it to a date at which Peter was still alive. By his manner of allusion to the Fourth Gospel it is plain that he himself realizes a contrast between it and the Synoptics; and this, perhaps, reminds us of the animadversions of Eusebius on certain men who held that the Gospels were at variance as between themselves. He is content to call its author John. For his own knowledge as to its origination he is evidently dependent on tradition; and then the question arises: who were the elders (*ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων*)[2] of the allusion, and to what locality did they belong? And again, what were the sources of their information?

Unquestionably the opinions of such a man as Clement must be treated with respect. They were based on what, for him, was sufficient evidence; yet here again it is necessary to remember that his methods of criticism were those of his own period. That he means the Apostle John may be freely admitted; a possibility remains that, having ascertained that the Fourth Gospel originated with a John, his own thoughts turned instinctively to John the Apostle and son of Zebedee.

To revert to Irenaeus; and, with him, to Polycarp: is it altogether fair to class them with 'pious but stupid Churchmen of the second century[3]'?

Whatever the illumination of the former as theologian, he was in any case a man of mark; he had been a great traveller, important missions had been entrusted to him; as Bishop of Lyons he

[1] Euseb. *HE*, vi, 14. 'Eine Einseitigkeit der alexandr. Anschauungsweise,' Lange, *Das Evglm. Joh.* p. 25.

[2] The Greek term (*πρεσβύτερος*) does not necessarily connote ecclesiastical office but might also be suggestive of advanced years.

[3] Raven, *op. cit.* p. 64.

occupied a prominent post. In his judgement the author of John's Gospel is the Apostle John; how, then, has he arrived at the belief? It surely cannot be a case of mere conjecture[1]. Whatever the exact extent of his intimacy with Polycarp in the days of his youth, his memory can scarcely have altogether failed him when he told of the very place where Polycarp had sat and held discourse with John; it is not likely that Polycarp was his one and only authority. The hypothesis is preferable that other sources were at his disposal[2]; and that he subjected them to such tests as, with the limitations of the times, he was competent to apply. The fact nevertheless remains that the decisive word Apostle is missing from the testimony of Irenaeus. As for Polycarp, there is no sufficient reason to distrust Irenaeus's statement relative to the intimacy of the former with a John and with others who had seen the Lord. What the Bishop of Lyons evidently cannot say is that Polycarp, on being asked whether the John he had known was really the son of Zebedee, Apostle, Beloved Disciple, Evangelist, had emphatically answered in the affirmative[3].

The situation is not otherwise in the case of Polycrates[4]. Of the two extant fragments of his writings one is a letter addressed by him, towards the close of the second century, to Victor, Bishop of Rome. In it there stands as follows: In Asia also mighty elements of the Church (*μεγάλα στοιχεῖα*) have fallen asleep.... Philip of the twelve Apostles at Hierapolis and his two aged virgin daughters, another of his daughters...at Ephesus. Moreover John, he that reclined in the bosom of the Lord, who as priest wore the sacred plate (*τὸ πέταλον*), martyr (*μάρτυς*) and teacher, he too fell asleep at Ephesus.

Whether there be here confusion between Philip the Evangelist and the Apostle Philip[5] is disallowed by some[6]; but on the perhaps safe assumption that there is, it might appear that the John named

[1] Wernle, *Quellen*, p. 10; Harnack, *Chron.* i, p. 657.

[2] Cf. Drummond, *op. cit.* p. 348; Gutjahr, *op. cit.* p. 14.

[3] Jülicher, *op. cit.* p. 364.

[4] Bishop of Ephesus. He flourished about the same time as Irenaeus. As the leader of the Bishops of Asia Minor he played a prominent part (*ca.* A.D. 190) in the Paschal controversy.

[5] Euseb. *HE*, iii, 31. [6] Cf Scott-Moncrieff, *op. cit.* p. 193.

is outside the number of the twelve. That Polycrates, acquainted, probably, with the Fourth Gospel, is himself evidently persuaded that the John who slept at Ephesus was the son of Zebedee may be conceded; why his allusion to the golden High-priestly frontlet[1]? Why the term used which might suggest a martyr-death[2]? The main point is the non-use, by Polycrates, of the decisive words Apostle and Evangelist.

We will pause here, and gather up the threads. In the preceding chapter the latest possible date of the Fourth Gospel was pushed back to a relatively early period; what now appears is that, before long time had elapsed, it was generally, not universally, regarded as the work of one who, albeit not thus expressly designated, was nevertheless so alluded to as to indicate his identification with the Apostle John. And further, the opinion seems to have been wide-spread that his home was in Asia Minor. Once more, it is true that in one instance a term which might imply actual martyrdom is used of him; otherwise his peaceful death at Ephesus was generally assumed. That 'direct and express ascription (of the Fourth Gospel) to the Apostle begins (*ca.* A.D. 181) with Theophilus of Antioch[3]' is, no doubt, quite true, only then the question arises; was such ascription justified by fact? Must it, on the other hand, be said that all that connects the Apostle with the Gospel 'runs out rapidly in mere legend[4]'?

Whatever be the case, the situation is complicated as a John other than the Apostle John appears on the scene.

This brings us to Papias[5]. Of the work in five books penned by

[1] 'Wie unkritisch Polykrates in diesem Brief zu Werke ging, ergiebt sich daraus, dass er Johannes als den Hohenpriester mit dem πέταλον geziert darstellt und hiermit eine in seiner Zeit bereits bestehende Gewohnheit die hohepriesterliche Würde auf den christlichen Bischof zu übertragen unchronologisch in die apostolische Zeit einführt,' Scholten, *op. cit.* p. 74.

[2] μάρτυς, a witness. The term could also mean martyr.

[3] Sanday, cited by Bacon, *Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, p. 90; Scott-Moncrieff, *op. cit.* p. 199. In his *Ad Autolycum* Theophilus speaks of John as an inspired man. It would appear that the first to attribute literary activity to John the Apostle was Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 83), yet in respect of the Apocalypse only, and by implication Justin locates its author in Asia Minor. See Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 14.

[4] Bacon, *op. cit.* p. 91.

[5] The story of his martyrdom at Pergamus seems to have arisen from a confusion of names and may be disregarded.

him, probably late in life, fragments only remain; the crucial passage runs thus: But if anywhere anyone also should come who had companied with the elders I ascertained (first of all) the sayings of the elders ('as to this,' not 'to wit') what Andrew or what Peter had said, or what Philip, or what Thomas or James, or what John or Matthew or any other of the disciples of the Lord (had said), and (secondly) what Aristion and John the Elder, the disciples of the Lord, say. For I supposed that the things (to be derived) from books were not of such profit to me as the things (derived) from the living and abiding voice[1].

Quite properly Eusebius observes that the name of John occurs twice. That by the John first named Papias means the Apostle John is obvious, for he ranks him with other Apostles; as for the second John, he is, to all appearance, sharply differentiated from the former John; not only is he not classed with Apostles but he is expressly designated John the Elder[2]. If, in like manner as the Apostle John, he is spoken of as a disciple of the Lord, it is a distinction which Aristion shares with him; yet he is also differentiated from the latter by a term highly suggestive that, not simply advanced in years, he is a personage of importance. If so, where? An answer might come from Eusebius, who, for reasons of his own, is not unprepared to believe in the story of the two Johns in Asia and of the two tombs at Ephesus[3]. The question then is: was he

[1] Euseb. *HE*, iii, 39. As translated *EB*, ii, col. 2507. The Greek runs as follows: *Εἰ δέ που καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους, τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν ἢ τί Φίλιππος ἢ τί Θωμᾶς ἢ Ἰάκωβος ἢ τί Ἰωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν (εἶπεν), ἅ τε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης (οἱ) τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν.*

[2] Robson (*JTS*, xiv, p. 440) gets rid of one John by reading: . . . *ἢ ἡ Ἰακώβου ἢ Ἰώαννα ἢ* . . . and remarks: 'a natural and proper pair (Lk. xxiv, 10) to whom enquirers after authentic records would always resort.' The emendation is ingenious but quite unconvincing. For Mr Robson's identification of Aristion with the Beloved Disciple see Excursus II. Krenkel (*Der Apostel Johannes*, p. 142), identifying John the Presbyter with the Apostle John, discovers John Mark in the John first named by Papias. Yet another emendation is offered by Larfeld (*Die beiden Johannes von Ephesus*, p. 184), who, reading *τοῦ Ἰωάννου μαθηταί* instead of *τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταί*, insists that Aristion and John the Elder were disciples of the Apostle John.

[3] Euseb. *HE*, iii. 39; vii, 25.

and alive, and Aristion also, when Papias made his inquiries, and did Papias actually hold speech with him? Here the change of tense is probably decisive, what Andrew and others 'had said,' what Aristion and John the Elder 'say'[1]; and besides, Papias himself alleges his own decided preference for the living voice. It accordingly appears that, as a young man, he had not only seen but conversed with this second John who, brought by him on the scene is not the Apostle John but John the Elder. And it is just here that Irenaeus is caught tripping: for, himself meaning the Apostle, he refers to the Bishop of Hierapolis as hearer of John as well as associate of Polycarp. Not so, says Eusebius, correcting the mistake. Papias by no means asserts that he was himself a hearer and eye-witness of the holy Apostles, but relates how he had received the doctrines of faith from such as were of the number of their friends[2].

It might, then, be inferred that he with whom both Papias and Polycarp held converse in their early manhood was not the son of Zebedee, but an aged disciple of the Lord who was in repute in the Churches of Asia as John the Elder. Yet is the further assumption warranted that, besides this John the Elder, whoever he might be, there had also been resident in Asia Minor and at Ephesus another John, he who was an Apostle and one of the Twelve[3]?

While the story of the two tombs at Ephesus, if not purely legendary, is at the most suggestive of a claim asserted by each to be the place of sepulture of a renowned personage[4], there are other grounds for hesitating to answer in the affirmative. They are

[1] The use has been held to be a historical present introduced for the sake of variety, in [2] misunderstood of what men who have passed away still say to us, or [3] of statements actually heard and fresh in the mind. The last explanation is adopted above.

[2] Euseb. *H.E.* iii. 39.

[3] Stanley for Clemens, p. 806. And see Holmes, *op. cit.* p. 24. Lardner (*op. cit.* p. 182) writes: 'Die Aussprüche [Papias'] sind nach altchristl. Urtheile auch auf den Apost. Joh. [? zu beziehen] nur [dass] zweifelhaften.' And thus Bretschneider in *Inquiry concerning the origin of Christianity*, p. 104: 'the name "elder" was very commonly given to the heads of the Church [but] it is not to be assumed by John the Apostle.'

[4] Euseb. *H.E.* xxxix. p. 161.

separately discussed elsewhere[1], and it will suffice if, at this point, they be specified in few words. And first, it is clear that a John located in Asia Minor is identified in tradition with the Beloved Disciple who figures in the pages of the Fourth Gospel. The assumption being that the latter is a real personage, there is, to say the least, very grave difficulty in identifying him with the Apostle John. In the second place, it is not any longer possible to use the word 'universal' of the tradition which brings John son of Zebedee to Ephesus to die a natural death in extreme old age. Another stream of tradition must be reckoned with, and with the result that ample room must be made for the probability that, never quitting Palestine, he suffered martyrdom, and thereby completely fulfilled the recorded (Mk x. 39) prediction to himself and his brother James.

'The tradition of Asia Minor,' it has been said, 'knows but one John only, who accordingly must be either the Apostle or the Elder[2]'; and it is, no doubt, true that for the ancients the residence of John son of Zebedee in Asia Minor appears to have been an 'uncontested historical fact[3].' Not necessarily will it be accounted fact by the modern student. As he reviews the situation he will perhaps be led to agree that the question really is of two traditions, which, by the end of the third century, had been combined in the assertion that two Johns had resided at Ephesus, the one being the Apostle and the other the Elder[4]. He may go a step further; with an admission that the earlier and more trustworthy tradition, if decisive for some aged disciple who had companied with Jesus, is not by any means decisive for the Apostle John. And, although arguments from silence are precarious, he will pay added heed to the fact that in respect of the latter Ignatius has no single word to say[5].

But to bring this chapter to a close. The allusion being to the external evidence for the traditional authorship of the *Fourth Gospel*, it has been remarked of it that it constitutes 'that portion of the field in which conservative theology has hitherto believed

[1] See Excursus I and II. [2] von Dobschütz, *LZ*, Nrs. 52–53, col. 1779.
[3] Schanz, *Evang. d. h. Joh.* p. 2.
[4] von Soden, *Early Christ. Liter.* p. 429. [5] See Excursus I.

itself to have gained its securest successes[1]'; and a case very much in point is the confident appeal made to such evidence by the staunch upholder of the traditional authorship[2] with whose verdict this chapter began. Whether the successes so claimed are indubitable is quite another question; and we must admit that neither for the residence of the Apostle John in Asia nor yet for his authorship of the Gospel called by his name is the external evidence of such a nature as to banish doubt[3]. On the contrary, it is highly probable that, when the field of internal evidence has been explored, we shall rather agree that were anyone, knowing nothing of the traditional belief, to peruse our Gospel, it would scarcely occur to him to seek for its author among the immediate disciples of Jesus[4].

[1] *EB*, ii, col. 2545.

[2] Polidori De Wette (*op. cit.* ii, p. 223), with allusion to the external evidence, gave it as his opinion that 'in dieser Hinsicht steht unser Evglm. nicht schlimmer, ja besser, als die drei ersten und als die paulinischen Schriften.' 'The external evidence,' says Evans (*op. cit.* p. 84), 'is wholly in favour of St John's authorship.'

[3] It must be said with Cohu (*The Gospels and Modern Research*, p. 412) that 'the external evidence... is utterly inconclusive as to its (*sc.* the Fourth Gospel's) Apostolic authorship.'

[4] Heitmüller, *SNT*, ii, p. 707. And see *Contentio Veritatis*, pp. 223 f.

CHAPTER IV

INTERNAL EVIDENCE

In the two preceding chapters, inquiry being kept strictly within the field of external evidence, it was provisionally decided that, in the first place, while the Fourth Gospel cannot be earlier than the latest of the Synoptics, there is apparently no valid reason which requires a date subsequent to the fourth decade of the second century; and next, that the case for the traditional authorship was by no means made out. A possibility may remain that 'in some way or other John son of Zebedee stands behind' the Gospel which bears John's name[1]. As it is we cannot but already feel that, be his relation to it what it may, he eludes discovery in the very region in which that Gospel is held to have originated; and that it is not at all unlikely that, with the lapse of time and for whatever reason[2], the distinctive title of Apostle attached itself to a John whom an earlier generation had been content to speak of as (together with other titles of distinction) a disciple of the Lord[3].

We now pass from external to internal evidence. The first question which arises is this: what *direct* evidence relative to its authorship is afforded by our Gospel itself? As for the second, it is concerned with *indirect* evidence; we shall ask: what impressions does our Gospel convey with regard to the personality of its author?

[1] Harnack, *Chron.* i, p. 677.

[2] According to Schmiedel (*Evang. Briefe u. Offenb. des Joh.* p. 7) the confusion arose—as in the case of Philip and Hierapolis—from claims advanced by the Church of Ephesus to have had an Apostle as its founder. Forbes (*op. cit.* p. 173) aptly remarks: 'Ephesus did not become a famous religious centre of apostolic renown, like Rome and Jerusalem, as would naturally have been the result in case an apostle from the Twelve had long resided there.'

[3] Albeit the allusion is specifically to Polycrates, von Soden's pointed remark (*Early Christ. Liter.* p. 427) applies generally: 'Though so many titles of honour are...heaped upon this John, that of Apostle, the highest of all in those days, is not among them.'

The present chapter shall accordingly be divided into two main sections.

(i) *Direct Evidence*

We will remark at the outset that the question of the 'self-testimony' of our Gospel is approached, regarded and decided in ways which illustrate a wide diversity of view on the part of scholars. On the one hand it is resolutely maintained that 'the Fourth Gospel claims to be the work of an eye-witness of the life of Jesus'; that he who speaks in xix, 35 'can be none other than the Evangelist himself,' who, 'throughout constant in declining the use of an "I,"' vouches, as eye-witness, for the truth of what he relates, and gives it to be understood that his place was very near to Jesus; the disciple whom Jesus loved, he is identified with the nameless disciple of i, 37 ff., and with him who, acquainted, xviii, 15, with the High Priest, follows Jesus to the High Priest's Palace; it is said expressly of him, xxi, 24, that he penned the Gospel; as he is ever and again coupled with Peter, it is natural to look for him in the little group of intimates told of in the Synoptics; in the last analysis he is John the Apostle and son of Zebedee[1]. On the other hand it is contended that the Gospel's 'self-testimony' is exceedingly strange: the 'we beheld his glory' of the Prologue, i, 14, invites inquiry as to who it is that speaks; as with the other Gospels so here, the manner is objective and anonymous; with ch. xiii a mysterious personage is brought on the scene who, thenceforward eclipsing Peter, is ever to the front; unlike Peter and the rest, he is steadfast at the Cross, and vouches for the reality of the death of Jesus; the meaning of xix, 35, is that he is the authority on whom the tradition of the Fourth Gospel rests; in the event it appears that the question really is of two traditions, and that the one which points to this Beloved Disciple is to be deemed equal, if not superior, to that which is referred to Peter. It is urged further that the 'self-testimony' becomes utterly complicated

[1] So, generally, Barth; *Das Johannesevglm.* pp. 5 ff. Cludius (*Uransichten des Christenthums*, p. 51) allowed that the rank of eye-witness is claimed by the Evangelist. Westcott (*St John*, pp. v–xxi), gradually narrowing down the choice, is decisive for the Apostle John. In like manner Cohu, *op. cit.* p. 419, note.

when, xxi, 24, the authority of the unnamed Beloved Disciple is confirmed by men who, writing in the first person, are themselves unknown—as if, forsooth, such testimony would be needed in the case of an actual Apostolic witness. The 'self-testimony' of the Gospel, it is added, raises more riddles than it solves; and, far from establishing the authenticity of the work, it arouses suspicion which merges in doubt[1].

The situation is probably more complex than is suggested in the former quarter. Nor is there over-statement, in the second quarter, of what are certainly curious phenomena. Not only does 'the author (of the Gospel) nowhere give his name,' but the fact that 'he designates himself in mysterious hints[2]' enhances our perplexity.

But let our inquiry begin with the Prologue[3] of the Gospel. In two places the first person plural is met with; and it is perhaps safe to infer that, inasmuch as the 'we' of *v.* 16 is accompanied by an 'all' (ἡμεῖς πάντες) the allusion there is to believers generally, whether eye-witnesses or not[4]. The case is somewhat different with *v.* 14; the question there is whether the 'we beheld' (ἐθεασάμεθα) implies physical sight or spiritual perception; and if the former alternative be adopted[5] the allusion is naturally to persons who had actually seen Jesus. That granted, it certainly appears that the Evangelist expressly lays claim to be such an one himself;

[1] Thus, in outline, Wernle, *Quellen*, pp. 12 ff.

[2] Weizsäcker, *Apos. Age*, ii, p. 207. 'Aller Streit wäre geschlichtet, wenn der Verfasser sich in seinem Evglm. selbst nennte. Aber er thut es nicht.' So Lücke, *Comment. über das Evglm. des Joh.* i, p. 85. And thus A. R. Loman (*Het Evan. van Joh. naar Oorsprong, Bestemming en Gebruik in de Oudheid*, p. 17): 'Nergens zegt de auteur, of dat hij een der Apostelen is, of dat hij Johannes heet.'

[3] Jn i, 1–18.

[4] 'Die ganze Christenheit,' Hengstenberg, *Das Evglm. des heil. Joh.* iii, pp. 396 f. O. Holtzmann (*Das Johannesevglm.* p. 198) writes: 'Die Gemeinde der Gotteskinder.'

[5] 'The original word in the N.T. is never used of mental vision,' Westcott, *op. cit.* p. xxv. To the same effect Sanday, *op. cit.* pp. 76 f. And thus Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 187: 'L'Évangeliste parle comme un temoin oculaire de la vie de Jésus.' The second alternative is preferred by *int. al.* W. Bauer, *HBNT*, II, ii, p. 15. And see Heitmüller, *SNT*, ii, pp. 733 f.; who comments at length on the phrase τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ.

'by his use of the first person plural he associates himself with other eye-witnesses of Jesus' appearance on earth[1].' It does not follow that he claims to be one of the Twelve; neither, we will add, is the fact established that he had actually been an eye-witness. On the contrary, he may have had resort to literary sanctions of the age of which more hereafter.

Whether he be the nameless disciple of i, 37 ff. or not, the Beloved Disciple stands full in view from xiii onwards; and inasmuch as he is found, xix, 26, at the Cross of Jesus, his presence is generally suspected in the *crux* of commentators, xix, 35: 'And he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true (ἀληθινὴ) and he (ἐκεῖνος) knoweth that he saith true (ἀληθῆ, things that are true), that ye also may believe.'

Is it really he, the Beloved Disciple, eye-witness, Evangelist, who speaks in the perplexing verse? A very natural inference would be that it comes from another and a later hand; from the pen of certain unknown personages who, for whatever reasons, are constrained to add their testimony to the credibility both of the narrator and of his report[2]? If he it really be, is he pointing to himself? If so, the method adopted by him is peculiar; if he means thereby to indicate his authorship he does so in strange fashion. Still more singular is it that, if he be thus mysteriously alluding to himself as both eye-witness and Evangelist, he, to all appearance, makes appeal for support to some third person whose identity is also veiled: 'He that hath seen hath borne witness (*sc.* the Evangelist), and his witness is true'; it is vouched for by another authority: 'and that one (ἐκεῖνος) knoweth that he (*sc.* the Evangelist) saith things that are true.' And besides, questions are invited by the sentence with which the ambiguous verse ends: 'that ye also may believe.' Who are the 'ye'? Had need arisen to combat in-

[1] Wendt, *op. cit.* p. 207. Cf. 1 Jn i, 1 ff. Zahn (*Einl.* ii, p. 467) writes: 'Turning to the Prologue we at once come across, not indeed an "I," but a thrice repeated "we" which includes an "I," the "I" of the author.'

[2] This raises the question, to be discussed later on, of the homogeneity or otherwise of the Fourth Gospel. It may be remarked here that the 'blood and water' of the preceding verse xix, 34, whatever the occurrence, are, in this connexion, held to be symbolic of the Supper of the Lord and Baptism. Otherwise Kreyenbühl, *Das Evglm. der Wahrheit*, ii, p. 663.

credulity, or to assert the authority of a Gospel which had not yet attained to general acceptance?

Taking the verse as it stands, it is not unreasonable to say of it that the intention is to place the reader in the presence of the Evangelist[1]. As for the puzzling allusion (ἐκεῖνος), opinions differ; upon the one hand it is affirmed that the term can be used by a speaker of himself and is often so used in this very Gospel[2]; the case is said to be one in which 'the author is simply turning back upon himself and protesting his own veracity[3].' On the other hand a third person is discovered; yet here again opinions differ as to who he is, and conjecture has turned from any human guarantor to dwell on the risen and ascended Lord[4]. But however this may be, the author of the Gospel apparently figures in the verse; and, if so, the choice lies between two alternatives; either he is thus pointed to by others, or he adopts an oblique way of indicating himself. In the latter case he claims to be an eye-witness; and, should he be but the secondary historian, he must be judged, not by modern standards, but by the literary sanctions of his own period.

A third perplexing passage now demands attention. By common consent ch. xxi is an Appendix[5]; whether *vv.* 1–23 come from the same pen as do the preceding chapters or not, there is no room for doubt that the two final verses (24, 25) are the addition of a later hand. Taken in connexion with *vv.* 1–23 they amount to an 'express assurance[6]' that 'the disciple which beareth witness of

[1] Who, according to Wellhausen (*Das Evgm. Joh.* p. 89), distinguishes himself from the eye-witness to whom he appeals and who is the Beloved Disciple.

[2] A case in point is Jn ix, 37. Westcott, *op. cit.* p. xxv. And see Steitz, *Über den Gebrauch des Pronom. ἐκεῖνος im vierten Evglm.* See also Kreyenbühl, *op. cit.* i, p. 168: 'aus dem gesagten ergiebt sich...dass der Verfasser sich selber ἐκεῖνος nennen könne.'

[3] Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 78.

[4] Sanday, *ibid.*; Zahn, *op. cit.* ii, pp. 474 f.; W. Bauer, *HBNT*, II, ii, p. 177. See E. A. Abbott, *Joh. Grammar*, pp. 284 f.

[5] With Jn xx, 30 f. a perfectly adequate conclusion is reached by the Gospel.

[6] Wendt, *op. cit.* p. 213. The 'express assurance,' according to Hausleiter (*Zwei Apos. Zeugen*), of Andrew and Philip, who, on his theory, are joint authors of Jn xxi.

these things and wrote these things[1]' was the disciple whom Jesus loved. Those who say so add: 'and we know (οἴδαμεν) that his witness is true.' Then comes a change from the plural to the singular: were the 'many other things which Jesus did' to be 'written every one, I suppose (οἶμαι) that even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written.' Thereupon the Appendix chapter reaches its abrupt close.

The second of the two verses is, as we have seen, explicitly referred by Origen to the Apostle John; and in any case one might naturally infer that the 'I' who speaks in it is, or claims to be, himself of the number of the eye-witnesses, for the manner of the allusion is such as to suggest personal knowledge rather than second-hand information. But his identity shall be left the enigma that it is[2]; the immediate question being far more nearly connected with the emphatic declaration of the preceding verse. Who are the speakers in it? Is it certain who the person is to whom they refer? How comes it that they are in a position to substantiate the accuracy of the narrative which they so positively assign to his pen? Why, again, is it that, on the assumption that they deem him no second-hand reporter but an eye-witness, both he and his Gospel should require their guarantee? It has indeed been suggested that their declaration in no way turns on the authorship of the Gospel but is concerned solely with the truth of the Gospel-contents[3], yet the suggestion is hard to accept. To all appearance a three-fold assertion is contained in the verse;—the disciple referred to is a still living witness[4]; he is author of a work which has reached its conclusion in the verse antecedent to the statement; the 'we,' qualified to bear testimony, are themselves eye-witnesses.

[1] Calmes (*op. cit.* p. 34) writes: 'selon nous, les mots καὶ ὁ γράψας ταῦτα doivent s'entendre, non de tout l'Évangile, mais seulement des versets qui précèdent, où il est question de l'immortalité eventuelle du disciple bien-aimé.'

[2] Holtzmann (*HCNT*, iv, p. 230), remarking on the non-Johannine word οἶμαι, speaks of Apologetics led astray to think of Papias.

[3] Baldensperger, *Prolog.* p. 110.

[4] Or, being dead, speaks in his book. 'L'emploi du présent ne prouve pas que le disciple vive encore; il rend temoignage actuellement par son livre,' Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 949.

Who are the 'we'? Of certain answer there is none whatever[1]. Refuge might be taken in the conjecture that they are Ephesian Elders[2]; yet so as to leave their date an open question.

To what personage do they refer? Obviously to the mysterious Beloved Disciple[3]; with their 'this is the disciple' they point back to the passage which immediately precedes their statement, and in it he figures. Is it quite so certain that he is one and the self-same person as the Apostle John[4]? As is shown elsewhere, the identity is hard to establish[5]; for the moment assuming it, the situation is clear, the son of Zebedee is of course equated by the 'we' with the Beloved Disciple. Otherwise everything depends on whether the process of confusion between two distinct persons has been accomplished or not. In the former contingency they, the 'we,' mean (without saying it) John the Apostle, in the latter they are referring to him who is spoken of as a disciple of the Lord.

They are, anyhow they say that they are, in a position to render two-fold testimony; is it possible to take them at their word? If the Beloved Disciple be really the Apostle John and the Beloved Disciple-Apostle be really the Evangelist, yes; what if they, meaning the Apostle, do but reflect the unfounded opinion of a later day? The answer would again be in the affirmative were the Beloved Disciple, being other than the Apostle, really author of the Fourth Gospel; yet here again the case for his direct authorship may be hard to prove. Room must be made for the conjecture that, in view of circumstances held by them to justify their action, they give authoritative expression to beliefs current in their midst.

[1] De Wette (*op. cit.* ii, p. 229) says of the 'unbekannter Urheber' (of *v.* 24) that he was 'einer der jüngern Zeitgenossen.' W. Bauer (*HBNT*, II, ii, p. 189; cf. Holtzmann, *op. cit.* p 229) finds the allusion reminiscent of the tradition as given by Clem. Alex. and of the Muratorian Canon.

[2] Hennell (*op. cit.* p. 105) instances the conjecture of Grotius that the 'we' points to the Church at Ephesus.

[3] Alex. Schweizer, *Das Evglm. Joh.* pp. 59 f. And see p. 239; where Schweizer, remarking that he who appended ch. xxi declares the Evangelist to be a disciple and eye-witness, viz. the Beloved Disciple, whoever the latter was, adds: But is this true to fact?

[4] Schwalb (*Christus und die Evangelien*, pp. 198 f.) is of opinion that the author of ch. xxi clearly differentiates the anonymous 'Lieblingsjünger' from the sons of Zebedee.

[5] See Excursus II.

And well might it be asked: wherefore is it that one so positively stated to be eye-witness and Evangelist—and perhaps Apostle—should require the anonymous testimony to himself and his work? That zeal is manifested by the 'we' is clear enough; yet it is possible to urge that the line taken by them is not exactly calculated to advance their cause; but that, on the contrary, they go near to cast a slur on the very personage for whose credit they are so evidently concerned[1]. They have acted, shall it be admitted? in all good faith; the tentative conjecture shall follow that, in the said action, they were conscious of and responsive to a need of their day. Men had looked askance at our Gospel; and hence steps were taken by the 'we' to obviate objection and win acceptance for the treasured work.

A dilemma is proposed; either the Apostle John is the author of the Gospel, or it has been written by someone else who personates him. Thus when it is said: 'the author is either the eye-witness (and, with every probability, the son of Zebedee) or, with resort to artifice and mysterious hints, he poses as such...and good friends of his are prompt with their imprimatur for what is a sheer imposture; for they, knowing his testimony to be false, declare it to be true[2].' Apart from the objectionable way of putting it, a false issue is raised by the second alternative in that it reads back modern standards into a remote past. What at the present day would be utterly indefensible was not simply condoned but recognized and sanctioned by the literary etiquette of the ancient world: 'it was characteristic of the spirit and custom of ancient historians and poets and especially those of the Bible, to live themselves into the modes of thought and expression of great men, and by imitating their thoughts and feelings, make themselves their organ[3].' In other words, no blame attached in those days to writers

[1] 'Ein Zeuge, dessen Zeugnis selbst erst wieder bezeugt werden muss, kann nicht als eine sehr vertrauenswürdige Person erscheinen,' Schmiedel, *Evglm. Briefe und Offenbarung des Joh.* p. 15. And see Lützelberger, *Die Kirchl. Tradition über den Apos. Joh.* p. 188.

[2] Barth, *op. cit.* p. 7. Cf. Lightfoot, *Bibl. Essays*, p. 80.

[3] Kirkpatrick, *Divine Library of O.T.* pp. 40 f. See also Percy Gardner, *Ephes. Gosp.* pp. 92 ff.; von Soden, *Early Christ. Lit.* pp. 14 f.

who composed and put forth works in another's name[1]; neither they nor their readers would be conscious of enacted fraud. So with the unknown author of Ecclesiastes who veils his identity with the great name of Solomon; so with the author of the Second Petrine Epistle when he calls himself 'Simon Peter'; so with 'Ephesians' if, as is not altogether inconceivable, it originates from a disciple of Paul. Precisely so here; if the Fourth Evangelist be really one who, in his Gospel, makes himself 'organ' of the eye-witness (whoever the eye-witness may be) he is not necessarily the '*falsarius*[2].' The course adopted by him would have the literary sanctions of his period, and the 'we' who, xxi, 24, give their testimony are not necessarily so many confederates in a literary fraud.

Let us agree that, in the event of necessary preference for the alternative which disposes of the traditional authorship of the Fourth Gospel as altogether untenable, there can be, in view of old-world literary usages, no question of wanton accusation and of libelling the dead[3].

The direct evidence of the Gospel has been surveyed. On the face of it, no doubt, it pleads for the conclusion that, whatever his identity, the author of the Gospel is an eye-witness, the Beloved Disciple. Yet with closer examination of the salient passages confidence passes over into doubt; and, as the case stands, it must be admitted that the Gospel does lay claim to Apostolic origin and authority in a way which is both singular and mysterious, and that its self-testimony raises more riddles than it solves[4]. Whether more light will be thrown on the problem by evidence of an indirect nature has yet to be seen.

With such indirect evidence our business now lies.

(ii) *Indirect Evidence*

As we pass from direct to indirect evidence the field to be explored widens; for, whereas in the former case our inquiry was

[1] Schmiedel, *op. cit.* pp. 12 f.

[2] Of the dilemma as propounded by De Wette, *op. cit.* ii, p. 229.

[3] As Sanday suggests, *op. cit.* p. 81.

[4] In the view of Scholten (*Het Evan. naar Joh.* p. 399) the Fourth Evangelist intended his Gospel to be accepted as by the Apostle John who is the Beloved Disciple.

concentrated on a group of but three passages, we now enter upon an examination of our Gospel as a whole. Nor shall we stop short there; on the contrary, it will become necessary to confront 'John' with the Synoptic Gospels, while an attempt must also be made to determine its relation to circumstance, event, or movement in the world of the period within which the date of its composition has been held to fall. We shall further have to address ourselves to the vexed question whether our Gospel be a unity or a composite work.

The issues, in short, are numerous; and the consideration of them will spread itself over many pages. But in the second section of the present chapter, our Gospel being taken as a whole, and by itself apart, the main questions are these: What impressions are conveyed by it as to the personality of the Evangelist? Does it vouch for the first-hand knowledge of an eye-witness? Or does it reveal the secondary historian who constructs his situations after the manner of his age?

Be the author who he may, there can be no doubt whatever that he addresses himself to a Gentile community or communities. It is not simply that he writes in Greek; for, quite apart from the fact that the New Testament as a whole is a Greek book[1], precisely the same course is adopted by a writer whose addressees—if the superscription of his Epistle[2] be taken literally—are specifically Jewish Christians. A decisive proof is that he is at pains to translate[3] and is ready with his explanations[4]. He might, or he might not, be resident in their midst.

Next comes the question of his nationality. Is he himself a Gentile? Such a contention has been raised, and not once or twice; an English pioneer of criticism satisfied himself that the Fourth Evangelist was 'no Apostle or any Jew[5]'; 'a sincere Christian... and a Greek': such was the verdict of a master of English prose[6]. It must be admitted that there is force in the argument[7]; for his

[1] Deissmann, *New Light on the N.T.* pp. 29 f.
[2] 1 Pet. ii, 1.
[3] Jn i, 42; ix, 7; xx, 16.
[4] Jn ii, 6; vi, 4; xix, 31, 40.
[5] Evanson, *op. cit.* p. 226.
[6] Matthew Arnold, *God and the Bible*, p. 284.
[7] Which Scott-Moncrieff (*op. cit.* p. 84) minimizes.

incessant allusions to 'the Jews' are so acrimonious[1] and so objective[2] in their nature as to suggest that he differentiates himself from their race. Yet there are counter-arguments which may be deemed strong enough to weigh down the balance on the other side, if it does not at once follow that he who records the Saying: 'Salvation is of the Jews[3]' was obviously himself of Jewish origin. Adverse voices are not silent; yet the general trend of scholarship is to allow and to affirm that he came from, originally belonged to, Jewish Christianity[4]. 'John, like Paul, was a Jew[5]'; 'there is nothing to preclude his Jewish birth, his style and methods of representation favour its admission[6].'

And such is really the case. Looking to the diction of the Gospel, it is surely true to say that, penned for Gentile readers for whom Jewish terms and usages had to be translated and explained, it throughout reveals a distinctively Semitic mode of thought by its phraseology, its frequent Hebraisms, its comparatively limited vocabulary[7]. No doubt its author 'writes in a style which is peculiar but quite literary[8]'; there are nevertheless features which suggest that the foreign language acquired by him has not been so entirely mastered that its resources are fully at his command. That he breathes a Greek atmosphere is unquestionable; as unquestionable does it appear from the Hebraisms he indulges in that our Gospel comes from a Jewish hand[9].

'The style of the narrative alone is conclusive as to its Jewish authorship[10].' This point decided, the further question arises: Was

[1] Scholten (*Het Evan. naar Joh.* p. 439) writes: 'Is het mogelijk om in zulk een oordeel over het wederstrevend Israël een geboren Jood te erkennen? Daar komt bij, dat de schrijver overal over de Joden spreckt als over eene vreemde natie.' To the same effect Schenkel, *Das Charakterbild Jesu*, p. 251. But see Schleiermacher, *Einl.* p. 337.

[2] As an Englishman speaks of 'the Germans,' or 'the Danes.'

[3] Jn iv, 22. [4] Weizsäcker, *op. cit.* ii, p. 218.

[5] von Dobschütz, *Christ. Life in the Prim. Church*, p. 218; *Probleme des Apos. Zeitalters*, pp. 92 f.

[6] Holtzmann, *Das Evglm. des Joh.* p. 16. [7] Barth, *op. cit.* pp. 7 f.

[8] P. Gardner, *Ephes. Gosp.* p. 45. And see De Wette, *Lehrbuch.* ii, p. 213.

[9] Thoma (*Genesis des Evglm. Joh.* p. 787) writes: 'Er hat mit der Muttermilch jüdische Denkart eingesogen.' And thus Herder (*Von Gottes Sohn, der Welt Heiland*, p. 275): 'er dachte Ebräisch und schrieb Griechisch.'

[10] Westcott, *St John*, p. vi. In the opinion of Lücke (*op. cit.* pp. 41ff.) the

its author a Jew of Palestine? Did he belong, upon the other hand, to the Diaspora? Was he, that is, a Hellenistic Jew?

The point is not settled by the source of his quotations from the Old Testament; sometimes he quotes from the Greek Bible (LXX) while at other times he approximates more nearly to the Hebrew text[1]. Appeal might be made to his doctrine of the Logos, but at this stage of our inquiry it must be left an open question whence it was derived. What certainly appears probable is that his diction has closest affinity, not with the literature of Hellenistic Judaism, but with that of Palestinian learning[2]. An important consideration then is whether he himself be thoroughly familiar with the scenes and the circumstances of the country with which his narrative is primarily concerned. Does he so know his Palestine as to establish it that Palestine had actually been his birthplace and his home?

It is in matters such as this that a writer who, posing as an eye-witness, is altogether destitute of any real knowledge of locality and conditions, is almost certain to give himself away by confusion or mistake.

Speaking generally, the Fourth Evangelist is not open to suspicion. It cannot be proved against him that, in respect at all events of localities, he is guilty of the slip or blunder which would betray his ignorance[3], if research has as yet failed to identify one or other of the places specified in his report[4]. There may of course be 'some hidden and allegoric meaning' in his particularizations, and the point will come up again; yet 'every critic remarks in the style, albeit more Greek than Palestinian, reveals the born Jew who had long resided in Asia.

[1] Scott-Moncrieff (*op. cit.* p. 76) inclines to 'the supposition that the Evangelist used some catena of Messianic quotations compiled. it may be, by different hands.'

[2] See Credner. *Einl.* pp. 264 f.

[3] Schmiedel, *op. cit.* p. 16. Otherwise Scholten (*Het Evan. naar Joh.* p. 431): 'De Evangelist is blijkbaar geen ooggetuige en van het tooneel der gebeurtenissen verwijdert.' With allusion to Jn i. 29, 35; ii. 1 ff. Cludius (*op. cit.* p. 64) asks: could the author so have written had he been a Palestinian Jew, and familiar with localities? And see his remarks on pp. 65 f. On p. 67 he writes: 'Die Mähre von Bethesda... verräth auch einen von Jerusalem fern lebenden Verfasser.'

[4] 'In most cases the difficulty resolves itself into our ignorance of the local geography, not into the writer's,' Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 548.

Gospel a number of details which do not seem in themselves important, but which give to the narrative an air, which is in fact somewhat delusive, of being a very exact narrative[1].' 'Delusive' in a sense it may be, and perhaps it is; there is nevertheless an air of verisimilitude about certain details which goes far to convey an impression that they are traceable to actual personal reminiscence. Yet it might be too venturesome to say of such details one and all that, often irrelevant enough, they yet betray the vivid recollections of a narrator who never stays to ask whether a thing be trivial or not, but who is fain to describe scenes photographed on his mind—even side incidents[2].

Whether the Fourth Evangelist, in any case no Gentile, be a Palestinian or a Hellenistic Jew, he is in a position to draw on his own personal acquaintance with the 'Holy Land[3]'; and in the second alternative (which is the less likely of the two) an inference might be that, although his temporary residence is there no longer, he had travelled up and down in it as having eyes to see and using them.

Yet it may not be so clear that his knowledge extends from geography to political and ecclesiastical organization. A charge here brought against him is that he has perpetrated a blunder than which none more glaring can be conceived[4]; in that, with his thrice-repeated and emphatic allusion to Caiaphas[5], he assumes the Jewish High-priesthood to be an annual appointment when as a matter of fact the office was tenable for life[6]. 'Being high priest that year':—it must be confessed that the definitive phrase 'that year' gives the reader pause; and besides, it is not a little curious that the person referred to is so casually introduced when he is of such exalted rank[7]. If gross error there be—and the Evangelist be really a Jew—it is no satisfactory explanation which accounts for it by a long interval between the events narrated and

[1] P. Gardner, *op. cit.* pp. 56 f. [2] Barth, *op. cit.* pp. 7 f.

[3] 'At any rate he is intimately acquainted,' says Cohu (*op. cit.* p. 474), 'with the Holy Land and especially Jerusalem.'

[4] Schmiedel, *op. cit.* pp. 16 f

[5] Jn xi, 49, 51; xviii, 13; ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου.

[6] Heitmüller, *SNT*, ii, p. 808; W. Bauer, *HBNT*, II, ii, p. 115; Jülicher, *Einl.* p. 380. [7] εἷς δέ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν Καιάφας.

the telling of them with the confused memories of extreme old age. Other explanations are, perhaps, more to the point; with his emphatic 'that year' the Evangelist really meant 'that fateful year,' the 'year of all years,' 'the acceptable year of the Lord[1].' Perhaps it really was so; on the other hand there is force in the suggestion that he was simply accommodating himself to local usages, in respect of the Asiarchs, for the sake of Gentile readers on a foreign soil[2]. A contingency remains that the responsibility for the dubious statement is not attachable to himself[3].

Let him have the benefit of the doubt. Another point must be raised; and it again turns on the exactitude or otherwise of the report of this Jew eye-witness as he claims, and is held, to be. The question ceases to be of narrative and is now concerned with discourse[4].

It has been said[5] of the Fourth Gospel that, rich in 'tender and unearthly beauty' it is suggestive of solemn cathedral voluntaries improvised upon the organ of human speech. Yet it is a just criticism which insists that the Evangelist's ideas, if sublime, are few; that they are continually reiterated in well-nigh identical form; that there is a poverty of vocabulary, a sameness in manner of presentment[6]: 'if the same great conceptions and ideas recur over and over again, the language becomes almost monotonous, colourless,—yes, almost poor[7].' The admission is abundantly necessitated that precisely these features are ever and again illustrated in the speeches of the personages who play their respective parts in the wonderful drama of the Fourth Gospel story. It may be quite true that the characters are invested with an individuality of their own; it is equally true that, having played their part, they often vanish from the scene. Once more; is it quite the case that they pass out of sight as men of flesh and blood and not like

[1] So Westcott, Lightfoot, and others. It is to beg the question when Scott-Moncrieff (*op. cit.* p. 89) writes: 'He does not say that he was *the* high priest *of* that year.'

[2] Holtzmann, *HCNT*, iv, p. 160. Otherwise Clemen (*Entstehung des Joh. Evglms.* p. 216), who discovers an explanation in the allusion Lk. iii. 1 ff.

[3] The question of interpolations is discussed in later chapters.

[4] A subject which will come up again.

[5] By Drummond.

[6] von Soden, *op. cit.* p. 13.

[7] Luthardt, *op. cit.* p. 19. But cf. Westcott, *op. cit.* pp. 1 f.

characters in some legendary tale?' Might it not rather be said of some of them that they 'appear in a strange twilight . . . they profess to be actual personalities, yet they live only the life of typical characters,' and that, as for the Evangelist, he loses the whole of his interest in both persons and situations as soon as they have served his doctrinal purpose[1]? The question will come up again; let it be observed in the meantime that it is precisely when they begin to speak that the uniform note is perceptible. There is little if any variety in the manner of their discourse. Admittedly their language is Johannine. Or to put it thus: the Evangelist has 'borrowed a speech peculiar to his school,' and it is in that speech that all his characters discourse[2].

Let it be observed at this point that the claim raised by the Evangelist (or advanced on his behalf) is not simply that of having been an eye-witness. The idea of an ear-witness is included in the claim. When it is said of him that 'his witness is true' the meaning undoubtedly is that, if his report be trustworthy in respect of things seen with his eyes, it is not one whit less trustworthy in the case of things heard with his ears.

Then the weighty consideration arises: no matter who the personages are, the speeches which the Evangelist purports to report are assuredly characterized by a remarkable sameness of style or tone. They, the said personages—each one with an individuality proper to himself—must surely have displayed their individuality in the manner of their discourse. They are certainly not found so to do; and the conclusion is unavoidable that the asserted ear-witness Evangelist is anything but a true witness if verity be contingent on exactness of report. The speeches must be, to some extent, constructed speeches. In any case the Evangelist has allowed himself a very free hand[3].

[1] Westcott, *op. cit.* pp. lxxi, lxxv; Barth, *op. cit.* p. 30.

[2] von Soden, *op. cit.* pp. 399 ff. To the same effect Wrede, *Charakter und Tendenz des Evglm. Joh.* p. 21.

[3] von Dobschütz, *Christ. Life in the Prim. Ch.* p. 222.

[4] Treating of the 'subjective form' of the Johan. Auferstehungsbericht' Eduard (*NKZ.* xxi. (1910) p. 632) writes: 'es gibt auch in tagträumen Leben eine doppelte Art, Gedanken zu bewahren und anderen zu vermitteln. Entweder nimmt man wirklich den Wortlaut durchaus festhaft und anderen

To which it may be added that his own reflexions are sometimes so merged in reported conversation or discourse that it is no easy thing to decide who precisely the speaker is[1]. Sometimes the difficulty is less; thus, e.g., in the case of Jn iii, 16–22, 31–36; where we have in all likelihood the ponderings of the Evangelist rather than words assigned respectively to Jesus and the Baptist.

There is another important point. The professed, or alleged, eye- and ear-witness occasionally relates scene or incident in a manner strongly suggestive that no one is present but the persons immediately concerned, yet he appears to record what passed between them with the precision of an attentive listener to the spoken words[2]. That sources of information were at his command may be freely admitted; yet this is by no means a sufficient explanation, for, such sources granted, it must nevertheless be urged that they have been amplified by the Evangelist, and in terms of his own conceptions of what was likely to be said by the respective personages who figure in the narrative. But this is scarcely to go far enough; the conclusion is ever and again inevitable that the case, far from being one of an ear-witness's *verbatim*—or free yet sufficiently accurate—report, is actually of artificially constructed discourse. The position is well stated thus: 'few will deny that in this Gospel the prerogative of the ancient historian to place in the mouth of his characters discourses reflecting his own idea of what was suitable to the occasion, has been used to the limit[3].'

gegenüber reproduzirt, *oder* indem man allen Nachdruck auf den Gedankengehalt legt.' The latter method, it is added, is better calculated to convey the real significance of the spoken word, and it is that employed by the Fourth Evangelist.

[1] 'Zudem verschwimmen die ihm (Jesus) geliehenen Worte öfters mit den eigenen Reflexionen des Verfassers,' Reuss, *Geschichte der heil. Schriften des N.T.* p. 208. See also von Soden, *op. cit.* p. 412; Weizsäcker, *op. cit.* ii, p. 225.

[2] Of this there are at least six striking instances: the night visit of Nicodemus, Jn iii, 1–16; the conversation with the woman of Samaria, Jn iv, 7–26; the scene laid in the palace of the Roman Governor, xviii, 33–xix, 14; the debate in the council, xi, 47 ff.; the Burial, xix, 38 ff.; the appearance to Mary Magdalene, xx, 11 f. See Alex. Schweizer, *op. cit.* pp. 241 ff.

[3] Bacon, *Introd. to N.T.* p. 257. See also Percy Gardner, *op. cit.* p. 93; *CBE*, pp. 392 ff.

But to sum up; and, of course, provisionally.

It was said by an earlier critic[1] that, while the external evidence for the authorship of the Fourth Gospel was unimportant, the internal evidence was so convincing that only a madman could reject it. As we have seen already, the internal evidence, where direct, is of such a nature that it raises more difficulties than it solves; looking to that indirect evidence which has just been rapidly surveyed, the case is somewhat different; nor is it altogether incredible that it should be maintained by a recent writer that 'everything in the Gospel points to a Jewish author who is an eye-witness of our Lord's Ministry, and a native of Palestine[2].' There is nevertheless ground for hesitation; but at this stage of our inquiry it must suffice to say of the Evangelist that he writes with a view to Gentile readers and that it is a reasonable conjecture which locates his *clientèle*, not to say himself, in Asia Minor. He is evidently a Jew; possibly of the Diaspora, with far greater likelihood of Palestinian origin. There is little need to question his personal acquaintance (somewhat blurred, perhaps, with the lapse of time) with scenes and localities depicted in his Gospel, but it must be confessed that doubt is awakened whether he (if he it be) was equally conversant with the political situations and conditions which obtained in Palestine. Vivid are his descriptions; the question nevertheless arises whether the protraits drawn by him are invariably true to life. Sometimes, it may be, actually present when his characters engage in converse, and sometimes, as it would appear, by his own showing, not so present, he, in any case no shorthand reporter, makes them discourse in his own language. Nay more, he places his own reflexions in their lips. As we find him actually setting down what Jesus thought and felt, the temptation is strong to account him one whose relations with Jesus had

[1] Gfrörer, *Die heilige Sage*. For some remarks on Gfrörer (who was far indeed from accepting the historicity of our Gospel) see Albert Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, pp. 160 ff.; Lützelberger, *op. cit.* p. 41.

[2] Cohu, *op. cit.* p. 474. Practically the same thing was said by Schleiermacher (*Hermeneutik*, p. 224): 'Aber betrachten wir das Evglm. im ganzen, so werden wir urtheilen müssen, es sei das Bericht eines Augenzeugen.' John's Gospel, he says elsewhere (*Einl* p. 318) is 'lauter Selbsterlebtes.' And thus Lange (*op. cit.* p. 24) 'Es (*sc.* our Gospel) beruht offenbar auf der persönlichen Erinnerung eines der frühsten Zeugen Jesu.'

been singularly close; anyhow we are disposed to agree that he was not so very far removed from the fountain-head of information[1]. What we find it hard to say is that his Gospel 'is a genuine Johannine work from the pen of the Apostle, who wrote from Ephesus[2].'

Author of our Gospel[3] the Beloved Disciple to whom it points may be; or, if not himself the author, then a main authority for that Gospel.

[1] De Wette, *op. cit.* ii, p. 233: 'nicht zu weit enfernt von der ersten Quelle.'

[2] Thus, confidently, Strachan, *DCG*, i, p. 881. The position now adopted by him (*The Fourth Gospel, its Significance and Environment*, p. ix) indicates a change of view.

[3] The main fabric of that Gospel. See chs. vii and viii.

CHAPTER V

THE JOHANNINE AND THE SYNOPTIC REPRESENTATION

Jewish scholarship has pronounced that Jewish scholars, steeped in Rabbinic lore, find when they come to study the Gospels carefully that they have not passed into a strange world[1]; and that, if 'the Gospel of Matthew stands nearest to Jewish life and the Jewish mode of thinking,' 'a greater familiarity with Jewish rites, with Jewish personalities, and with the geography of Palestine' is shown by the Fourth Gospel. 'The whole book was written by a born Jew[2].' And such, generally speaking, was a conclusion arrived at in the preceding chapter. A Jewish background was recognized; and albeit in regard to some points hesitation occasionally merged in doubt, it was decided that our Gospel bears the traces of a Jewish pen. Yet a contingency was reckoned with that the alleged eye- and ear-witness of its allusions might be not so much author of as authority for a work impregnated with Jewish thought.

Another stage of inquiry is entered. Hitherto ancient authorities have been questioned; and, the ground of external evidence traversed, there followed a general survey of our Gospel which passed from direct to indirect evidence. The time has now come when, confronting that Gospel with its three companions, we must institute that comparison which will pave the way for more definite conclusions on the three-fold question of its date, authorship, and claims to historicity[3].

To turn to the immediate subject. As every student knows, comparisons between the Johannine and Synoptic representations have been instituted again and again; with the result, in many

[1] Abrahams, *CBE*, pp. 164, 181.

[2] Kaufmann Kohler, *JE*, ix, p. 251. See also Brooke, *CBE*, pp. 318 f.; Jülicher, *op. cit.* p. 375.

[3] The question of substantial accuracy, it is said, is 'ultimately the more important,' Schmiedel, *EB*, ii, col. 2518; Heitmüller, *SNT*, ii, p. 707.

quarters, that an array of reasons is advanced for disallowing not only the genuineness but the credibility of a Gospel which, from its generally recognized peculiar character, is placed in a category by itself apart. And although 'the day is now over, or almost over, when the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists could be played off against each other in a series of rigid antitheses[1],' yet it will serve the present purpose to summarize objections and make some independent study of the situation.

Now, where objection is raised, the marked peculiarity of the Fourth Gospel is highly accentuated. It is regarded, not as the record of historical events, but as a manual of instruction of which the theme is Jesus, the divine Logos manifested in the flesh. The view further is that the Synoptic Jesus, human in his every lineament and child of his own age and people, is altogether unrecognizable in the Johannine Christ. As for the former, he is sharer in all the experiences which are the common lot of man, and, moved by tender pity, he performs his deeds of love; as for the latter, a God who walks this earth as a stranger, his signs are done but to manifest his own glory and omnipotence, to lead up to profound spiritual meditations. The one is the prophet-preacher who proclaims the Kingdom, the other is for ever discoursing of himself; the one is friend of sinners, the other prefers the company of seekers after truth; the one prays and the other can dispense with prayer. Nor is stress laid only on a sharp diversity in the portraiture of him who is the central figure; it is further urged that our Gospel and the Synoptists part company in the case of other personages, and that they are utterly at variance on matters, amongst others, of locality and date. The Baptist of the earlier Gospels is the great preacher of repentance, while as portrayed by the Fourth Evangelist he plays no independent rôle; whereas in the former case the recorded vision at the Baptism is a sign to Jesus, in the latter case all mention of the Baptism is suppressed, while the vision is granted to the Baptist to assure him as to who and what Jesus really is. With the Synoptists the scene is mainly laid in Galilee; with the Fourth Gospel it is largely transferred to Judaea and Jerusalem; in the former case the events are crowded

[1] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 540.

into one short year, in the other the Ministry is extended over three Passovers. In the one case the Jewish people are described with picturesque variety of type and class and section; not so in the other case, with 'John' they dwindle down to Pharisees and Priests and rulers of the people; as for the Pharisees they have become the very core of unbelieving Judaism in its hostility to Jesus. The Jews are pictured as in hopeless case; away with them to the devil, the Greeks for Jesus and for God! And again, the difference between the Johannine and the Synoptic representations of the Passion, the Death, and the Resurrection is regarded as fundamental[1].

For reasons such as these there is wide-spread agreement that, whatever be its interest and value as an early Christian document, the Fourth Gospel must be ruled out as a source for the Life of Jesus.

As we shall realize presently, the Fourth Gospel does, in many respects, present a striking contrast to its three companions. Common features and resemblances there may be; the fact remains that discrepancies are both numerous and of such a nature as to stare the instructed reader in the face. Nor is it destitute of significance that the very points which were raised a century and more ago are reiterated, often with next door to verbal coincidence, in the modern world. But in view of undisguised preferences for the Synoptic representation, room shall be made here for some remarks on the Synoptic Gospels.

It cannot be said of any one of them that it emanates directly from an eye-witness of the life of Jesus. They are alike in this respect that they are anonymous compositions. They are not three distinct and entirely independent narratives; on the contrary, two of the three are dependent on the third; the First and Third Evangelists (Mt., Lk.) had the Second Gospel (Mk) before them, and between them they incorporated the bulk of it into their respective works. They drew also on 'the non-Marcan document,' a collection of Sayings generally designated by the symbol 'Q'; other—to us quite unknown—sources were respectively at their command, with the result that both Mt. and Lk. have, each one,

[1] So, generally, Wernle, *op. cit.* pp. 14 ff.

additional matter peculiar to his own Gospel. The Synoptic Gospels are composite works; several *strata* of evangelic record are embedded in them, primary and secondary traditions. As for the earlier traditions, the primary elements, they are, generally speaking, to be looked for in 'Q' and in the Marcan Gospel. Or in other words; of our Four Canonical Gospels 'John' is certainly the latest —and perhaps the latest by a long way; as for the remaining three, they are nearer to the events they purport to relate, and it is safe to say of the Synoptic tradition that it stretches back to Apostolic times and to the very days of Jesus. The earlier the narrative the greater, generally speaking, the likelihood of its substantial historicity; and hence preferences accorded to the Synoptic representation are well grounded. Nor would such preference necessarily become unreasonable were it proved to demonstration that the Fourth Evangelist was none other than the Apostle John; for in that case account might not unnaturally be taken of failing memory consequent on extreme old age.

Let it be borne in mind that preference for the Synoptic representation as against 'John' is not invariably bound up with dogmatic prejudices—with the view that the historic Jesus never outsteps the limits of the purely human—but that it is compatible with a recognition of the claims made by the Johannine Christ.

There is another consideration. It has been said that answers to the questions inevitably raised when our Gospel is confronted with the Synoptics are certain to vary with the varying conceptions of a divine revelation to mankind; the remark follows that it is nothing short of a boon that Christian thought is no longer fettered by outworn mechanical theories of inspiration and interpretation in the case of the Bible literature[1]. To narrow down to the Gospels; in the old and disastrous view the Evangelists were passive agents, men who could not choose but write down words from divine dictation, 'living pens grasped and guided by an Almighty hand[2].' A more enlightened view obtains; and today—at all events in instructed circles—account is taken of their re-

[1] Barth, *op. cit.* pp. 13 f.

[2] 'Das Bibelbuch galt als Einheit, die Einzelverfasser nur als Griffel des hl. Geistes,' von Dobschütz, *Der gegenwärt. Stand der N.T. Exegese.*

spective personalities. Illustrating a marked diversity of type, of temperament, and of environment, their own proper individuality is never lost. Each one tells his own tale, and tells it in his own way. Neither to the men themselves nor to their respective writings does infallibility attach.

A contrast of some sort between 'John' and the Synoptics, then, there can scarcely fail to be. Diverse are the individualities of the respective Evangelists; what more natural than that there should be some display of diversity of style and standpoint and manner of presentment? Similarly in regard to choice of matter;—there would be nothing necessarily abnormal were this or that Evangelist, say at once the Fourth Evangelist, to refrain, on the one hand, from attempting to cover the whole ground, or, on the other hand, to supply what he deemed lacking in the other narratives[1]. Neither he nor the Synoptics are infallible. If he corrects them and makes his alterations in them, it is exactly what two of them have already done with a third; Mt. and Lk. have treated Mark with a very free hand. Let us add that mere priority is not in itself an absolute guarantee of accuracy, nor is inaccuracy necessarily connoted by lateness of date.

To proceed without further delay to a comparison which will fasten on the following questions:—Chronology, The Scene of the Ministry, John the Baptist, Miracle, The Discourses, The Synoptic and the Johannine Portrait of Jesus.

I. Chronology. The independent attitude of the Fourth Evangelist is manifested in his extension of the duration of the Ministry and in his bold transpositions of events and dates.

One instance is the date of the beginning of the Ministry. According to the Marcan Gospel[2], it was not until after the Baptist's imprisonment that Jesus entered upon his work; not so in the Fourth Gospel, where he is pictured as already active at a time when the Baptist, still at liberty, was still drawing followers to himself[3]. The narratives appear to be mutually exclusive; yet attempts have been made to bring them into some sort of harmony by urging that the otherwise unexplained readiness of Simon,

[1] Zahn, *Einl.* ii, p. 499. [2] Mk i, 14; cf. Mt. iv, 12.
[3] Jn iii, 23 ff.

Andrew, and the sons of Zebedee to obey the call of Jesus[1] is accounted for by a discipleship which dated back to that earlier stage of the Ministry told of by the Fourth Evangelist, who does but amplify the Marcan narrative in a way which it necessitates and positively invites. Whether such a conjecture meets the case is another matter[2].

Again. It certainly appears from the Synoptic representation that the public Ministry of Jesus began and ended within a single year, otherwise the Fourth Evangelist, who expands it to a period which includes at the least three Passovers[3]. How, too, attempt is made to reconcile the discrepancy, it has been urged, by no means to conviction, that all three Passovers were, in reality, one and the same. The contention, again, is that, apart from hints and allusions to seasons of the year which themselves are suggestive of the longer period[4], it is impossible to conceive of the many events recorded by the Synoptists as happening within the space of one short year[5]. The Fourth Evangelist, it is maintained, is nearer the truth, and the companion Gospels are, implicitly, in agreement with his reckoning. Very likely such is the case.

To turn to the Cleansing of the Temple. According to the Fourth Gospel it occurred at the beginning of the Ministry[6] while it is placed by the Synoptists at the close of the Ministry[7], and is evidently regarded by them as the decisive act which precipitated the Death of Jesus.

Harmonists have struggled to escape the difficulty. One suggestion is that there were really two Cleansings of the Temple, the one at the outset and the other at the closing scenes[8]; few to-day would venture to advance and uphold it[9], and perhaps many

[1] Mk i. 14 pars.

[2] Wernle, *op. cit.* p. 23.

[3] Jn ii. 13 [? v. 1]; vi. 4. xii. 1. Stanley (*Sermons on Apost. Age*) remarks on the far longer Ministry allowed to by Irenæus.

[4] Cf. Mk ii. 23.

[5] Westcott, *op. cit.* p. lxxxi.

[6] Jn ii. 13 ff.

[7] Mk xi. 15 ff. pars.

[8] So Hengstenberg, *op. cit.* i. pp. 156 f. Ashworth (*Words of Passion Week*, p. 107) is of opinion that the repetition of the occurrence is the simplest and most natural explanation of the contents of the documents. Westcott (*Introd. Study of Gk. Gosp.* p. 22) finds it 'quite possible to believe that the Temple was cleansed and received a second purification.'

[9] 'Un tel expédient,' says Loisy (*op. cit.* p. 306), 'aurait fait sourire le grand Origène.'

would agree that such a demonstrative act, the expression of a lofty zeal, was only once so mildly punished? Where preference obtains for the Johannine dating, it is maintained that the conflict had really begun at the very first, and that the brilliant triumph of the Evangelist, publicly announced all, had been but a series of persons from a prolonged but unconscious blunder at the very head-quarters of Jewish orthodoxy. The case would probably be one in which the Fourth Evangelist has converted a Synoptic blunder into his story is good ground for doubt.

The instance of probability in every sphere the Johannine grounds for the position of the story in the Synoptics of course, while in the case of our Gospel it has to bear the effect of an anti-climax[3].

Another instance of 'wilful alteration' as it would appear, is that of the *respective datings of the Feasts-Day of Jesus.*

I put first the Synoptic representation: Jesus, it would appear, celebrates the Passover with the Twelve. That depart from the Upper Room, the scene changes from the Mount of Olives to 'a place which was named Gethsemane', quickly there follows the Arrest. As for the Crucifixion, it takes place the day after the celebration of the Passover[4]. Now on, says the Fourth Evangelist, in spite of a flagrant paradox of to Jesus and his friends while we have already that the paschal of the latter was limited to The Twelve. For from everything that happens with the Paschal Meal, he is at pains to insist it is understood that the Passover lay still ahead[5], and that, when the night of its celebrating had arrived, the body of Jesus was already in the tomb. The two statements are that he is represented that they ought not to eat Friday

[1] Wendt, *op. cit.* p. 12

[2] A supplement of the narrative in the Fourth Gospel is suggested by Holtzmann, *Hand-Com.* ii. p. 183, points the dating of that Gospel. Schmiedel, *Encyc. Bib.* ii. p. 1871, finds a reference of thought from the preceding story, Jn ii, 1 ff., but that is quite another matter.

[3] von Soden, *op. cit.* p. 668. [4] Mk xiv, 1—xv, 32 *pass.*

[5] Jn xiii, 1 ff.; xviii, 28, xix, 14. The point is rather hard to make clear to modern judgment and consciousness, hypothetically precise with another connection, as was the Passover-meal. Dreyfus, *Der Schluss-Akt Christi*, p. 588, note.

At once they part company, and in regard to the day of the month; the Synoptists assign it to the 15th of Nisan, 'John' to the 14th. They are, accordingly, in flat contradiction in regard to date.

Reconciliation[1] being hazardous, not to say impossible, the one question is: Which of the two datings is correct?

There is a strong consensus of opinion in favour of the Johannine dating. Jewish scholarship is in no doubt at all: 'the one possible date of the Crucifixion' is that given by the Fourth Evangelist[2]. It is urged in other quarters that, albeit the Synoptists are apparently convinced that the 'Last Supper' was a legal Passover[3], yet their narratives when closely scrutinized reveal such glaring inconsistencies and incongruities[4] as to make them 'bear unwilling testimony'[5] to the emphatic statements of the Fourth Gospel, while traces of early confusion are detected in a recorded Saying which points to Paschal anticipations which, entertained by Jesus, were frustrated in the event[6]. And further, appeal is held to lie to the Apostle Paul; for although his account of the Institution of the Eucharist[7] is quite inconclusive in regard to

[1] Thus when it is argued by Zahn (*op. cit.* ii, p. 514) that 'to eat the Passover' was a *façon de parler*; a vague term popularly used of the whole seven-day—seven-and-a-half-day—Feast which began with the slaughter of the Paschal lamb, and that the men referred to Jn xviii, 28, were really thinking of the *Chagiga*, or sacrificial meal of 15th Nisan, which was held, not like the Passover, after sunset but in the course of the day. Sanday, at one time inclined to such a view (*DB*, ii, p. 634), has since abandoned it. B. Weiss (*Das Joh. Evglm.* p. 248) is unconvinced by Zahn's 'Polemik.' Another line of argument is to the effect that the Passover celebrated by Jesus was not the legal, but an anticipated Passover.

[2] Kaufmann Kohler, *JE*, ix, p. 25.

[3] Though silent as to formal rites and accessories of Paschal observance, they apparently specify certain concomitants (not the lamb) of the Passover-meal, while the recorded singing of a hymn might be significant. Spitta (*Das Evglm. Joh.* p. 295) takes the contrary view.

[4] They relate (Mk xiv, 2) a decision to take no action on the 'feast day,' yet it is on that very day that the Arrest takes place, while they naively tell of occurrences and transactions (Mk xiv, 47; xv, 21; xv, 46) altogether incompatible with enactment or impracticable at the time in question.

[5] Sanday, *DB*, ii, p. 634.

[6] Lk. xxii, 15. The conjecture here is that the phrase 'this Passover' does not point to a Passover then and there being celebrated but to the Passover of the morrow which, greatly desired by Jesus, would not be celebrated until after his Death. See *JTS*, July 1904.

[7] 1 Cor. xi, 23 ff.

date, there are two beautiful comparisons which suggest a dating of the Crucifixion identical with that afterwards insisted on by the Fourth Evangelist. In the one case Paul conceives of Jesus as the true Paschal lamb whose Death on the Cross was exactly coincident with the slaughtering by thousands of lambs destined for the Paschal meal: 'for our Passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ[1].' In the other case Paul's thoughts turn from first-fruits offered in the Temple on the Resurrection Sunday to the Risen Lord: 'now hath Christ been raised from the dead, the first-fruits of them that are asleep[2].' Nor does appeal stop short with Paul; a passage in one of the Apocryphal Gospels is regarded as significant: 'the sun must not go down upon a murdered person on the day before their Feast, the Feast of unleavened bread[3].'

Yet Paul's thought of Jesus as 'the Christian's Paschal Lamb' is not necessarily decisive for historic date, while it may have 'induced the Fourth Evangelist to transfer Jesus' hour of Death to the day on which the Paschal lamb was sacrificed[4].' So runs a suggestion; and in any case voices are raised on behalf of the Synoptic dating of the Crucifixion[5]. Such dating, it is maintained, is perfectly conceivable, nor do the earlier Evangelists relate any single occurrence which might not quite well have happened on the feast-day; their statement is deemed far more deserving of credit than is that of 'John[6].' And besides, objections raised to the Synoptic dating of the 15th Nisan (it is said) by no means necessarily establish the date of the 14th, but rather tend to favour hypotheses advanced by daring critics who, contesting both dates, proceed to assign the Crucifixion to one or other Friday prior or

[1] 1 Cor. v, 7 f. Yet, as O. Holtzmann (*Das Joh. Evglm.* p. 35) points out, without specific reference to any Paschal lamb. [2] 1 Cor. xv, 20.

[3] Rendel Harris, *Newly Recovered Gosp. of Peter*, pp. 43 f., 64 f.

[4] Weinel, *St Paul, the Man and his Work*, p. 303.

[5] Hitchcock (*op. cit.* p. 24) takes refuge in the suggestion that the discrepancy 'might be explained away by an appeal to the original languages,' and adds: 'the four Evangelists are, however, unanimous that Jesus suffered on the 14th Nisan.'

[6] 'De geschiednis leert dus, dat Jezus med zijne discipelen op den 14den van Nisan het gewone pascha der Joden geviert heeft,' writes Scholten (*Het Ev. n. Joh.* p. 306). To like effect Schmiedel, *Das 4. Ev. gegen den drei Ersten*, pp. 96 ff.; Jülicher, *op. cit* p. 379; Schenkel, *op. cit.* pp. 253 ff.

subsequent to the Paschal week[1]. It is also said that artificiality is a conspicuous feature of the Johannine representation generally; and that in this particular instance the provisions relative to the Paschal lamb have been transferred, with characteristic symbolism and disregard of fact, to the Passion and the Death of the Johannine Christ[2]. So run the arguments, and they occasion pause.

The case here is probably one 'where the record in the Fourth Gospel may claim the greater internal probability[3],' whereas in the former case it must be allowed that the Evangelist has 'divorced the Cleansing of the Temple from its tragic connexion with the final catastrophe[4].'

II. The scene of the Ministry. This, by the Synoptists, is laid in the Galilaean homeland of Jesus; and, recording certain journeys outside Galilaean territory[5], they have nothing to say of visits paid to Jerusalem[6] save only the one which issued in his death. In sharp contrast is the representation of the Fourth Evangelist; for with him the scene on which Jesus moves during the period of his Messianic activity is Judaea[7], and in particular Jerusalem; but rarely does he appear in Galilee, and when there his stays are of brief duration[8]. No wonder that the discrepancy is insisted on[9].

The difficulty is scarcely met where the point is laboured of Synoptic hints and allusions which pre-suppose a familiarity on the part of Jesus with Judaea and Jerusalem[10]. Such familiarity might well be matter of assumption in the case of one who, himself a pious Jew, would naturally go up at feast-times to the metropolis from his Galilaean home; the strange thing would be were he

[1] Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 67.

[2] Wellhausen, *Erweit. und Änder. im 4. Ev.* pp. 30 f. See also W. F. Loman, *Het vierde Ev., Kenbron van Jezus' Leer en Leven*, p. 31.

[3] Wendt, *op. cit.* p. 13.

[4] von Soden, *op. cit.* p. 443.

[5] Mk vii, 24; viii, 27; x, 1.

[6] Apart from the story of the Childhood, Lk. ii, 41 ff.

[7] Which (Jn iv, 44 f.) is conceived of as his native land. The Saying is taken over from the Synoptics (Mk vi, 4), who naturally refer it to Galilee. Cf. Schwalb, *op. cit.* p. 208; Wendt, *op. cit.* p. 108; Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 553.

[8] Jn ii, 1 ff.; iv, 43 ff.; vii, 10 ff.

[9] Heitmüller, *SNT*, ii, p. 704; Schmiedel, *op. cit.* pp. 6 ff.; Holtzmann, *Das Ev. des Joh.* p. 3. The list of names might be easily enlarged.

[10] Mk iii, 7 f.; xiv, 3; xi, 1 ff.; xiv, 12 ff.

represented as being entirely without friends and acquaintances, not to say sympathizers, in and in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. The question at issue, however, relates definitely to the public activities of Jesus, and hence mere familiarity with particular scenes is not in itself to the point.

It is open to doubt whether the Synoptic and Johannine representations are so mutually exclusive as to necessitate a categorical 'either—or'; and the probability is that the discrepancy may be in part accounted for on the theory of diversity in respect of choice of matter. If so, it might be said of our Evangelist that, recognizing that Galilee had actually been a field of action[1], he decides that he himself will go into detail in respect of that Judaean Ministry which the Synoptists, not explicitly denying, insufficiently relate. As for the Synoptists, the probability again is that they not only invite assumptions of, but actually testify to a prolonged Judaean Ministry in that two of them fasten on that pathetic lament over Jerusalem[2] which is strongly suggestive of repeated effort and repeated failure in the course of frequent mission-journeys from Galilee to Judaea.

It may be so. On the whole it appears quite likely that such was really the case. The recorded utterance 'is a very important piece of evidence[3],' nor is it altogether childish play[4] to regard it as bearing out one feature of the Johannine representation[5]. And besides, were our Evangelist, in any case a Jew, a Jew of Jerusalem, he would naturally prefer to tell of the Judaean Ministry.

The contingency must be reckoned with that the Fourth Evangelist was also specially concerned to establish it against hostile voices that, far from having dragged out an obscure existence in such an out-of-the-world region as Galilee, Jesus had appeared and laboured openly at Jerusalem, at the very centre of

[1] 'Wir finden auch in diesem Evglm.,' says Neander (*op. cit.* p. 384). 'selbst guten Raum für die galiläische Wirksamkeit Christi.'

[2] Mt. xxiii, 37; Lk. xiii, 34. The Saying stood in Q, but is placed by Mt. and Lk. in different connexions.

[3] Wendt, *op. cit.* p. 10. Otherwise Schenkel, who (*op. cit.* pp. 13 f.) makes room for but one, and prolonged, stay in Jerusalem.

[4] 'Ein kindliches Vergnügen,' Jülicher, *op. cit.* p. 379.

[5] J. Weiss, *SNT*, i, p 377.

Jewish life, as it behoved one who desired to be regarded as the Messiah[1].

III. John the Baptist. The contention here is that the Baptist who figures in the Fourth Gospel wears but slight if any resemblance to the Baptist of the Synoptic representation; that the two portraits are singularly unlike.

A question might be whether either of them be strictly true to life; for there can be little doubt that 'the prophet's life was spread over a longer period of time, his mission more independent in character, his influence upon his own and upon succeeding generations more far-reaching, than' is implied by the manner of the Gospel representation[2]; and it is possible that the real Baptist at no time definitely attached himself to the cause of Jesus[3], but went his own way and rushed to a self-invited fate.

But this by the way. The Synoptic and the Johannine portrait of the Baptist are, no doubt, in some things unlike. In each case, however, the portrait is of a strong man, while the Johannine representation is not less decisive than the Marcan for an eminent personage[4]. Yet the fact remains that a process of subordination of John to Jesus is noticeable, which, setting in with Mark and continued in the two later Synoptics, reaches its climax in the Fourth Gospel. If the Baptist is magnified as recipient of knowledge supernaturally vouchsafed[5], a relatively unimportant office is assigned to him, and it would seem that his sole function is to bear witness to Jesus[6]. A time comes when he is dispensed with[7]. The strong soul, it has been said, is conceived of as a mere 'voice[8],' but this is surely to go too far.

[1] Cf. Baldensperger, *op. cit.* p. 120; Wrede, *Charakter u. Tendenz des Joh. Evglms.* pp. 48 f. And see Herder, *op. cit.* p. 307.

[2] Blakiston, *John Baptist and his relation to Jesus*, Preface. And see p. 194.

[3] Thus, positively, Schwalb, *op. cit.* p. 206.

[4] Herder rightly says (*op. cit.* pp. 269 f., 308) that our Evangelist shows no small honour to the Baptist.

[5] Jn i, 15, 27, 29, 30, 32.

[6] Jn i, 7, 8, 15, 19 f. Wellhausen, *Das Ev. Joh.* p. 103. According to Schwalb (*op. cit.* p. 207) the Baptist of the Fourth Gospel preaches, not repentance, but the Gospel; he has the same conception of Jesus as the Evangelist.

[7] Jn v, 30 ff.

[8] Baldensperger, *op. cit.* p. 59. Cf. Forbes, *op. cit.* p. 158.

We conclude that in the Johannine representation the Baptist is pre-eminently a foil to Jesus; and hence precisely those features are preserved which tell of one who, anything but a lay figure, was in high renown[1]. It is said in effect: John towered above his fellows, but Jesus is incomparably greater than he. Let it be added that the studied representation of the Baptist as a witness might be due to circumstances which, pointing to Baptist-disciples of a later day[2], had made it imperative to differentiate sharply between the 'lamp' and 'the light of the world[3].'

IV. Miracle. The contention is raised that the Fourth Gospel is in contrast with the Synoptics in that, along with changed motives and with significant omissions, the element of the miraculous is strongly enhanced.

To venture some preliminary remarks. In the popular mind, no doubt, a miracle is nothing short of a prodigy[4]; a startling occurrence which, in itself improbable, not only runs counter to experience but implies violation of Natural Law by one with whom 'all things are possible' and who plays as it were the part of a divine magician. With loftier conceptions of Deity the preference will ever be for the more sober view that the given occurrence, be it never so surprising and perplexing, may be, and probably is, the expression of Law as yet undiscerned or but partially understood, and that present difficulty will be resolved with a larger understanding of the range and meaning of nature. Faith not for a moment identified by him with mere credulity, the candid inquirer, prepared to encounter instances of the marvellous, will ever be resolute to cross-examine his documents and to apply every practicable test. More careful, more hesitating, will be his judgement 'in regard to stories of the miraculous which have come down from antiquity'; there may be this or that story in the Gospel

[1] Jn i, 19 ff. It may be remarked that the Evangelist, who (i, 29 f.) advances ample reason why John should yield allegiance to 'the Lamb of God' and 'Son of God,' gives (iii, 23 ff.) more than a glimpse of the real John in his independent rôle.

[2] Acts xviii, 25; xix, 1 ff. It is not said of the disciples here instanced that they regarded the Baptist as Messiah.

[3] Weizsäcker, *op. cit.* ii, p. 226; von Soden, *op. cit.* p. 415.

[4] 'Eine Abart des Wunders,' Traub, *Die Wunder im N.T.* p. 7.

records which he will elect to 'put quietly aside,' and it may be that he will have to 'leave it there for ever'; on the other hand its meaning may one day so dawn on him that it will then assume a significance of which he had never dreamt[1]. It will certainly be present to his mind that, if 'psychology is still very far from being an exact science,' 'the whole burden of recent research is in favour of the belief that we, even the least of us, are greater than we know[2]'; and, alive accordingly to the mysterious power exercised by mind on mind, and perhaps by mind on matter, he, not slow to admit that 'exceptional manifestations of psychic and spiritual force...were only to be expected in a Being of exceptional elevation and fullest capacity[3],' will probably go on to own that, however the case might stand with the disciples, Jesus is the greatest spiritual force the world has ever known. It will not necessarily follow that the recorded Gospel-miracles one and all will be accepted as they stand; on the contrary, some will quite possibly be referred to the misunderstandings of a later day and others to imperfect knowledge with consequent miraculous interpretation of what, for moderns, would be the natural event. Yet such deductions made, a residuum will clamour for acceptance.

But this is a digression. Reverting to the main question, we will observe in the first instance that one particular class of miracles is excluded by the Fourth Evangelist[4]. In the case of the Synoptics there is frequent mention of demoniac-cures performed by Jesus; and, by the way, it is widely conceded that he did actually heal many a sufferer who, in the conception of the age, was possessed by an evil spirit[5]. No such narratives occur in the Fourth Gospel;

[1] Harnack, *What is Christianity?*, pp. 28 ff.

[2] Raven, *op. cit.* p. 46.

[3] A. W. Robinson, *Sermon.*

[4] Otherwise H. Ewald (*Die Joh. Schriften*, i, pp. 25, 58, 221), who, discovering a gap between Jn v and vi, argues that the Evangelist, concerned to give a specimen of every class of miracle, had actually given a specimen of the class in question in the conjectured missing section. In like manner Spitta (*Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristentums*, pp. 189 ff.) accounts for the absence of any account of the Institution of the Eucharist.

[5] Harnack, *op. cit.* p. 28; Traub, *op. cit.* p. 41; Bousset, *Jesus*, pp. 23 f. Bousset finds the parable of the Unclean Spirit suggestive of frequent failure and relapse.

'John knows nothing whatsoever of the most frequent wonder-works of Jesus, the healing of demoniacs[1]; or rather, he declines to admit such Synoptic stories into his own Gospel. It is not that, assuming independent knowledge on the part of his readers of the 'many things that Jesus did,' our Evangelist refrains from needless repetition; nor will it do to plead that such stories are implicitly confirmed by his allusion to crowds who followed Jesus 'because they saw the signs wrought on them that were diseased[2].' The suggestions are alike precarious; and the inference is preferable that stories told of cures which others besides Jesus could perform[3] were deliberately suppressed by our Evangelist because out of keeping with his conception of Christ[4].

What miracles, 'signs[5],' are related by him? As commonly enumerated, these: The Water turned into wine[6], the Healing of the 'nobleman's' son[7], the Impotent man made whole[8], the Feeding of the Five Thousand[9], the Walking on the sea[10], the Man blind from his birth made to see[11], and the Raising of Lazarus[12]. The question, then, is whether there be really 'enhancement of miracle' with altered motive, and, the 'signs' being precisely seven, whether there be significance in the sacred number?

[1] Wernle, *op. cit.* p. 18. [2] Jn vi, 12.

[3] Lk. xi, 19. See Forbes, *op. cit.* p. 156.

[4] Loisy (*op. cit.* p. 58) infers reluctance to bring Jesus into direct conflict with demons. In the view of Neander (*op. cit.* pp. 307 f.) the omission is due to the fact that in Jerusalem, where the scene is chiefly laid, demoniac cases were rare. According to Herder (*op. cit.* p. 267) the Evangelist refused to allow such a Palestinian superstition to become 'ein wesentlicher Zug des Christenthums, ein Vorwurf der spottenden oder ein Glauben der thörichten Welt.' See also Lützelberger, *op. cit.* p. 286; Ballenstedt, *Philo und Johannes*, p. 73.

[5] The Fourth Evangelist generally prefers the term σημεῖον.

[6] Jn ii, 1 ff.

[7] Jn iv, 46 ff. RV (margin) 'King's Officer.' In the Greek τις βασιλικὸς.

[8] Jn v, 2 ff. [9] Jn vi, 4 ff. [10] Jn vi, 19 ff. [11] Jn ix, 1 ff.

[12] Jn xi, 1 ff. The Resurrection (Jn xx) and the Take of fishes (Jn xxi) are included by some, and others extend the list with instances of invisibility (Jn viii, 59: 'une sorte de miracle permanent,' Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 65), of omniscience (Jn i, 47 ff.), and of ability to pass through solid matter (Jn xx, 19 f., 26). According to Alex. Schweizer (*op. cit.* pp. 130 ff.) the genuine Johannine miracles are to be found Jn i, 49 ff.; ii, 13 ff.; iv, 16–18; v, 1–10; ix, 1–7; xi, 1 ff. And see Cludius, *op. cit.* p. 71.

There is a preliminary question; might it not be argued that the number could be reduced; inasmuch as two if not three of the 'downright wonders of omnipotence' which are held to illustrate enhancement are not peculiar to the Fourth Gospel but make their appearance in the Synoptics[1], and in that case there remain but, say, four 'signs' for consideration, e.g., the occurrence at Cana, the healing at the pool of Bethesda, the blind man given his sight, and the dead man brought back to life? Yet such a conclusion is unsafe; for, to begin with, the resemblance between the Synoptic story of the Centurion's servant and the Johannine story of the 'nobleman's' son, if striking, is not altogether decisive for identity; and secondly, assuming such identity elsewhere, there are added touches which differentiate between the respective representations[2]. That there are seven Johannine 'signs' to be reckoned with[3] must be allowed.

It must be said, then, that there is enhancement[4]. With the works of healing the effect is heightened; in one case the cure is performed from a considerable distance, in another blindness is from birth, in a third it is emphatically said of the sick man that he had been no less than 'thirty and eight years in his infirmity.' The enhancement may not be so marked with the Walking on the Sea and the two Nature-miracles, but it is nevertheless present. The very climax is reached with the Raising of Lazarus. In the case of Jairus' daughter it would appear that death had not actually supervened[5], while it is safe to assume the decease but a few hours past of the son of the Widow of Nain[6]. Otherwise the narrative which, pointing to Bethany, suggests unmistakably that the corpse already four days in the tomb had seen corruption[7].

[1] Mk vi, 34 ff. pars.; Mk vi, 45 ff. par.; Mt. viii, 5 ff. par.

[2] With allusion to the Feeding of the 5000 and the Walking on the Sea Schwalb (*op. cit.* p. 221) writes: 'Unser Evangelist aber hat sie noch vergrössert.' On the other hand Hart (*Exp.* 7th ser. v and vi), with similar allusion, eliminates the miraculous elements altogether

[3] 'Die ganze Reihe dieser Allmachtswunder steht doch als etwas völlig Neues da,' Wernle, *op. cit.* p. 18.

[4] As, writing in 1838, was affirmed by Hennell, *op. cit.* p. 106.

[5] Mk v, 39: *τὸ παιδίον οὐκ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει.*

[6] Lk. vii, 12 ff. According to Eastern custom but a very short interval elapsed between death and burial.

[7] Jn xi, 39: *ἤδη ὄζει.* 'Lazarus' Leiche strömt bereits Verwesungsgeruch

To pass on[1]. The further admission appears unavoidable that the Johannine 'signs' are conceived of as wrought with transformed purpose. The Synoptic Jesus is 'moved with compassion' for the leper[2]; his sympathies go out to Jairus[3], and to the father of the epileptic boy[4]; lest those who 'have nothing to eat' should 'faint in the way' to their homes, he supplies their physical needs[5]; the blind beggar is heartened to come into his presence[6]. Scarcely so with the Johannine Christ; his 'signs' are proof of his divine omnipotence and manifest his glory. Thus when at Cana he bestows his gift of wine; nor is there much trace of tenderness in the stories told of the 'nobleman' of Capernaum, of the sick man at Bethesda, of the man blind from birth. It is said of Jesus that he 'wept'[7] at the grave of Lazarus, yet he had not been promptly responsive to the sisters' message; and, knowing that his 'friend' was dead, he dwells on issues which shall mean a glorification of the Son of God and the awakening of faith. It is true to say that 'whereas the miracles of healing in the Synoptists are miracles of mercy and compassion, wrought because Jesus had sympathy with

aus ehe er erweckt wird.' Wrede, *op. cit.* p. 7. Of the contrary opinion Neander, *op. cit.* p. 355, note.

[1] Yet not without noting that the feature just instanced is highly characteristic—not always with dignified restraint—of the Gospel which bears the name of Matthew. The First Evangelist, 'on a lower level of spirituality,' occasionally displays 'an unreality, a lack of reserve, a desire to astonish, that makes one suspect that they (his recorded miracles) are pinchbeck and tinsel rather than the authentic gold.' 'They are too like the man-invented wonders of the religious romances.' 'One feels that they derogate from the dignity of Jesus' (Raven, *op. cit.* pp. 115 f.). This cannot be laid to the charge of the Johannine representation.

[2] Mk i, 41. [3] Mk v, 22. [4] Mk ix, 14 ff.

[5] Mk viii, 2 ff. [6] Mk x, 49.

[7] For some remarks on the significance of Jn xi, 35 f. see Oort, *TT*, 1909, pp. 536 f. Let the remark be ventured that, despite its beauty and its pathos, there is an anti-climax in the story. On the one hand it points to 'that higher eternal life which Jesus, in other places besides, claims to bestow on all who believe, a life which dwells in them even now, and because it is a life eternal and divine, survives the temporal death'; on the other hand it apparently descends to a lower level when it goes on to point to the mere prolongation of that earthly life to which, according to the story, Lazarus came forth from his grave (Wendt, *op. cit.* p. 101). The majestic words: 'I am the resurrection and the life' are rung out; what follows in the narrative robs them of their deep spiritual significance.

the sufferers, the miracles recorded by the Fourth Evangelist tend to the glory of him who wrought them. They are proofs, not of his humanity, but of his divinity[1].'

It has been affirmed of the 'signs' related by the Fourth Evangelist that they are 'downright marvels of omnipotence as God alone can "conjure" them[2].' Let it be asked here: What of the verdict to be pronounced on them from the modern point of view? Some, perhaps, admit of a natural explanation[3]; scarcely so others[4], and, a variety of suggestions notwithstanding, it must be allowed that they present serious difficulty. True, no doubt, that 'what is regarded as a miracle to-day may be known to be a scientific fact to-morrow[5]'; yet it must be owned that, taking the narratives as they stand, they are without satisfactory explanation within the known laws of nature, nor are such conditions fulfilled as might win for them the readier acceptance. It is certainly curious, and perhaps significant, that the Raising of Lazarus, which, according to the Fourth Evangelist, precipitates the closing scenes, is apparently unknown to the Synoptists; who, with greater show of probability, regard the Cleansing of the Temple as the decisive act which instigated the chief priests and the scribes to seek how they might destroy Jesus[6].

[1] Percy Gardner, *op. cit.* p. 280. In like manner Brückner, *Die vier Evangelien*, p. 75. And thus Calmes (*op. cit.* p. 2): 'C'est le Fils de Dieu opérant des miracles pour manifester sa divinité.'

[2] Wernle, *op. cit.* p. 18.

[3] E.g. The Healing of the 'nobleman's' son and of the impotent man.

[4] The Water turned into Wine, the man blind from birth, the Raising of Lazarus. With allusion to the Walking on the Sea, Granger (*The Soul of a Christian*, p. 109) pleads that 'there are serious reasons for hesitating before we declare that a human body cannot...float along the sea in defiance of gravity.' Schweitzer (*von Reimarus zu Wrede*, p. 373) thinks that the story of the multiplication of the loaves is true if the words 'they were filled' be struck out; others suggest O.T. influences (cf. Jn vi, 5 ff.; 2 Ki. iv, 42 ff.). As for the Lazarus story, the theory of catalepsy is advanced, 'nicht die geringste Spur eines wirklichen Todes' (Ammon, *op. cit.* iii, pp. 114 ff.).

[5] Hudson, *Law of Psychic Phenomena*, pp. 372 f.

[6] Mk xi, 18. See Bacon, *op. cit.* p. 349; Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 72; Burkitt, *Gospel History*, p. 222. Percy Gardner (*op. cit.* pp. 283 f.) is 'disposed to think that there was some actual historic foundation for the narrative,' and that 'it may be that the Fourth Evangelist has worked up the tale from his own point of view, and made it loom very large in the prospect.' Yet it is scarcely

A possibility must be reckoned with that a miraculous interpretation had been read into occurrences which would be otherwise apprehended and narrated at the present day.

But what of the Johannine 'signs' in the view of the Evangelist himself?

It is impossible to believe that the stories are of his own construction. In all likelihood they, or some of them, have reached him, in whatever form, from the lips or the pen of others; and, the decision made to utilize them, he tells them in his own way[1]. He scarcely troubles himself to ask whether they occasion doubt; if in his eyes they be literally true, it is unfair to charge him with 'crass credulity[2]' when he did but share beliefs which were common to the age. It might be near the mark to say of them that, while not deliberately constructed allegories[3], they really become such, as, employing them for his own ends[4], he is far more concerned for their spiritual meaning than for historical fact, albeit an appearance of historicity is conserved by him[5]. Their very number, conceivably, proclaims that, for the mystic who records them, their symbolism is the main thing[6]. 'As the Evangelist soars above the literal value of the words of his master, so he regards His mighty works as valuable indeed to impress the people in their natural form, but far more valuable in the higher meaning which shines through them[7].'

safe to say with A. V. Green (*op. cit.* p. 101) of the Raising of Lazarus that it was the one thing which above all others 'decided the definitely hostile action of the Jewish authorities.'

[1] 'He may have taken many liberties with his material. His treatment of Christ's words and deeds probably went much beyond "dotting the i's and crossing the t's," to use Sanday's phrase,' Johnston, *Philosophy of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 120.

[2] Wellhausen, *op. cit.* p. 103.

[3] 'Grossartig angelegte Allegorien...kunstvoll gebildet,' Brückner. *op. cit.* p. 75. But see Calmes, *op. cit.* p. viii.

[4] von Soden, *op. cit.* p. 396.

[5] Cf. Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 83.

[6] See Schwalb, *op. cit.* p. 218. The Johannine signs, says Herder (*op. cit.* p. 268) are 'symbolische Facta, typische Denksäulen.'

[7] Percy Gardner, *op. cit.* p. 277. Prof. Gardner adds: 'M. Doutté, who had a long experience in Algeria, tells us that he made the acquaintance of many local saints...and that the working of marvels was the seal of this vocation....The Fourth Evangelist takes this view as natural and universal.'

To bring this section to a close. The modern reader will be well-advised if, forgetting the 'outward narrative' of the Johannine 'signs,' he loses himself 'in its deeper significance[1].' His thoughts will then turn from earthly bread ministered by disciples and fasten on the Bread of Life for the soul[2]. The wine which has failed at Cana will speak to him of Judaism, the good wine thereupon provided of a new religion on its way to conquer the world: 'the waters of legal purification turned into the wine of marriage joy[3].' As for the story of the man born blind, he will be quick to find it pointing to him who is 'the light of men.' Similarly with the perplexing story of the Raising of Lazarus. It is deeply suggestive of that moral and spiritual change[4] which Paul conceives of as a death, a burial and a resurrection. The like figure occurs in the Burial Service prayer: 'We meekly beseech thee, O Father, to raise us from the death of sin unto the life of righteousness.'

V. The Discourses. Here, again, the Synoptic and Johannine representations are held to be mutually exclusive: — 'Jesus must have spoken just as the Synoptists make him speak[5]'; the Christ of the Fourth Gospel adopts 'the theological and philosophical language of the schools[6].' So, briefly stated, run multitudinous objections, and, as has been noted in another connexion, there is a strong family likeness between the criticisms of time past and time present. Let two specimens be placed side by side:—'Here in the Synoptists the popular form of oriental proverb-wisdom and instructive parable, there (in the Fourth Gospel) the profound allegory with appeal to profound reflexion; instead of pithy and easily retained sayings alike luminous and easy to retain, a series of witnessings and discussings in exalted tone and with utter disregard for the capacity of the hearers. . . . According to the Synoptics the demands of Jesus are for self-renunciation, for compassionate love,

[1] von Soden, *op. cit.* p. 390. [2] *Philochristus*, pp. 213 ff.

[3] Wernle, *op. cit.* p. 24.

[4] See Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 75: 'la résurrection corporelle de Lazarus symbolise la résurrection à la vie mystique par la foi.'

[5] Jülicher, *op. cit.* p. 372.

[6] von Soden, *op. cit.* p. 441. According to Keim (*Jesus von Naz.* i. p. 112) 'Jesus selber ist zum scholastischen Dogmatiker geworden.' And see Wernle, *op. cit.* p. 24; Jülicher, *op. cit.* p. 421.

for a taking of one's self in hand, for work for others; his warnings are directed against the danger of riches, worldly desires and anxieties; above all he preaches about the Kingdom of God and the conditions of entrance therein. Not so in the Fourth Gospel; the preaching of the Kingdom recedes, while Jesus becomes the dialectician who treats of his own divinity, and withal in singular, and by no means popular, style. In both cases he figures as teacher; in the Fourth Gospel the subject-matter of his teaching is well-nigh exclusively himself[1].' Thus speaks modern criticism; now for that of a century ago: 'Jesus, as pictured in the earlier Gospels, whether he be speaking, preaching, or disputing, never has resort to dialectic skill, to the ambiguity of artifice, to a mystical style; on the contrary, there is utmost simplicity and clearness, a certain natural eloquence which owes far more to mental genius than to painfully acquired art. In the Fourth Gospel he disputes as the dialectician; ambiguous is his language and mystical his style; he deals to such an extent in obscurities that even very learned people are quite in the dark as to the real significance of many of his words. In the one case there are short and pregnant sayings, parables so full of beauty and of inward truth as to grip attention and to sink deep into the soul; in the other the parabolic mode of teaching is practically absent. Here the question turns on conduct, rules of life, the Mosaic Law, errors of the Jewish people; there the speaker is concerned with dogma, with metaphysics, with his own divine nature and dignity[2].'

It may, perhaps, strike us that, in such-like allusions to the Synoptic Jesus, there is, in both cases, something which recalls the words of Justin Martyr; when, referring to 'the very doctrine delivered by Christ himself,' he goes on to say: 'short and pithy

[1] H. J. Holtzmann, *op. cit.* pp. 430 f. And see von Soden, *op. cit.* pp. 409 ff.; Loisy, *op. cit.* pp. 56 ff. With allusion to our Gospel Wernle (*op. cit.* p. 19) states the case thus: 'statt der Sache überall nur die Person.'

[2] Bretschneider, *op. cit.* pp. 1 f. An entirely opposite view is that of Bertholdt, who (*Histor. Krit. Einl.* iii, p. 1303) prefers the speech of the Joh. Christ and says of the Synop. Jesus that he speaks for the most part 'in dem gemeinen trockenen Lehrton jüdischer Rabbinen, ohne allen Schwung und Schmuck und Tiefe der Ideen.' It might be added that Wernle, in the remark cited in the previous foot-note, is reminiscent of one of Bretschneider's predecessors, viz. Cludius (*op. cit.* pp. 87 ff.).

are his discourses; no sophister was he[1].' On the assumption that the Fourth Gospel was actually known to Justin, it might be inferred that, if contrast was discerned by him, he nevertheless reconciled it to his own satisfaction. Perhaps he too would have said: 'it is not true then, that the Johannine Christ speaks like a sophist, and abstains from using brief and concise sayings[2].'

But let us look into the matter for ourselves.

We have already remarked on a certain monotony which pervades our Gospel as a whole. There is an absence of variety in the manner of the discourses generally, no matter who the speaker may be; the several characters, that is, hold converse in Johannine phraseology[3], and without individuality whether of idea or speech; conversations are reported at length when, apparently, there was no third person at hand. The question here being narrowed down to a single issue, the discourses placed by the Evangelist in the lips of his Christ, the fact must be reckoned with that, if 'some actual sayings of the historic Jesus[4]' be embedded in our Gospel, it is certainly not throughout a depository of genuine utterances of Jesus. Of *verbatim* report there can be no question; and the same thing holds good of the three companion Gospels[5].

Now, the position has been aptly stated thus: 'Jesus cannot have had, at the same time, the style and method of teaching which the Synoptists describe and that which the Fourth Gospel reflects. We must therefore attribute the language, the colour, and the form of these Johannine discourses to the Evangelist. The Gospel of John is a distillation of the life and teaching of Jesus from the alembic of the Apostle's own mind. It is his interpretation of the meaning of Christ's words, deeds and person derived

[1] *Apol.* i, 14: *βραχεῖς δὲ καὶ σύντομοι παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγοι γεγόνασι· οὐ γὰρ σοφιστὴς ὑπῆρχεν.*

[2] Drummond, *op. cit.* p. 20.

[3] The Evangelist, according to Eichhorn (*Einl. in das N.T.* ii, pp. 269 ff.), 'scheint sich einen eigenen relig. Dialekt, einen eigenen *τρόπος παιδείας*, gebildet zu haben.' In the interesting conjecture of Stronck (*De Doctrina et Dictione Joh. Ap. ad Jesu magistri Doctrinam et Dictionem composita*), he had made the style of Jesus his own. See P. Ewald, *op. cit.* p. 833.

[4] Percy Gardner, *op. cit.* p. 62. And see Burkitt, *Two Lectures.*

[5] 'It is undeniable that in no case can we be quite confident that we possess the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord,' McNeile, *CBE*, p. 220.

from intimate personal relations with him, and coloured and shaped by a long life of Christian thought and experience[1].'

It will be observed that the writer here quoted accepts the 'venerable tradition' as to Apostolic authorship. Where, and by well-nigh general agreement[2], he hits the mark is in his description of the Johannine discourses as a distillation from the alembic of the Evangelist's own mind. But he invites pause on a question which, raised by him in his opening sentence, recalls the assertion: 'a Jesus who preached alternately in the manner of the Sermon on the Mount and of Jn xiv–xvii is a psychological impossibility[3].'

And first in respect of manner. Not unreasonably might it be urged that, with ready adaptation to their environment, men doubly gifted with simplicity and profundity will naturally 'speak in the vernacular'—not descending to vulgarity—to uninstructed hearers, while they will adopt other modes of speech when dealing with more cultured and reflective minds. So it may have been with Jesus; his Galilaean hearers being, generally speaking, of a very different type from those with whom he came in contact in Judaea, he would be, as it were, one person in Galilee and quite another person in Jerusalem; to the Galilaean populace a man of the people and to scholars of Jerusalem one of themselves[4]. It was in the Holy City that his deeper teaching would naturally be given—to those who by comparison with the 'motley crowd' away in Galilee were 'cultured and responsible people[5].' And besides, a reminder comes that the Synoptic Jesus is represented as speaking, on one occasion at least, in precisely the same manner as the Johannine

[1] Stevens, *Theology of N.T.* p. 172. And see Herder, *op. cit.* p. 329; Johnston, *op. cit.* p. 119.

[2] 'Tout le monde admet volontiers maintenant que les discours de Jésus sont écrits dans le style de l'évangeliste,' Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 54.

[3] Jülicher, *Introd. to N.T.* p. 421. (The Engl. tr. of an earlier edition.)

[4] Delff, *Rabbi Jesus*, pp. 138 ff. But cf. Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, p. 41.

[5] Swete, *Studies in the Life of our Lord*, p. 130. 'Poscunt aliae dicendi causae, alii auditores aliam formam dicendi, admittit dives Jesu ingenium varietatem,' Fleck, *De Imagine Christi Joan. et Synop.* p. 10. And according to Hengstenberg (*op. cit.* iii, p. 404, see also p. 393) Jesus had 'eine doppelte Lehrweise.'

Christ;—when, 'in a moment of intense emotion, He turns from earthly hearers and addresses Himself to God[1].'

Secondly in regard to subject-matter. It is contended that the discourses placed by the Fourth Evangelist in the lips of Jesus leave men utterly in the lurch when it comes to the vitally important question: What is it that God looks for and what is alone decisive for life or death? The answer of the Fourth Gospel is this: believe on the Son of God who came down from heaven and believe that he is Jesus—an answer which has had a baneful effect on Christendom, for it is only too easy to make such a profession of belief without drawing nearer to God and becoming a better man. Very different is the answer of the Synoptic Jesus; with him everything is contingent on that doing the Will of God which involves uprightness, brotherly love, trust in God, humility, yearnings for God's Kingdom; of those who do the Will of God he says that they are for him mother or sister or brother[2]. Counter arguments are strong; it is urged that inasmuch as 'Christianity was a great crisis of civilisation' 'because it changed the internal man, creeds, sentiments, because it regenerated the moral man, the intellectual man[3],' the expectation is nothing short of reasonable that its Founder was far more than a great moral teacher. The personal equation cannot but come in; the question is not only of how and what Jesus taught, but of what he was in himself. It might further be argued that there are passages in the Synoptics in which he, clearly pointing to himself, assumes a position of authority and lays claim to the exceptional reverence of men. And again; if the Johannine Christ be represented as discoursing more frequently of himself, one reason, it is said, is not far to seek; the scene being laid mainly in Jerusalem, it was only natural that, with assertion of his Messiahship, he should have discoursed of himself at the headquarters of Judaism; and with resort to a terminology which, abstruse as it might be to some, was not neces-

[1] See on the 'Agalliasis' utterance (Mt. xi, 27 = Lk. x, 22) Raven, *op. cit.* pp. 130 ff.; McNeile, *St Matthew*, pp. 173; P. Ewald, *op. cit.* p. 834. The Saying, it stood in Q, is, in the view of J. Weiss (*SNT*, i, pp. 320 f.), 'Schwerlich ein Wort Jesu, sondern eher ein Stück Gemeindetheologie.'

[2] So, generally Wernle, *op. cit.* pp. 31, 19.

[3] Guizot, *Hist. of Civilisation*, i, p. 12. And see Barth, *op. cit.* p. 44.

sarily unintelligible to cultured Jewish hearers[1].' Once more; it is simply not true that our Gospel is altogether silent in regard to the importance of the life lived. On the contrary, the same Johannine Christ who requires belief in himself emphatically demands personal conduct inspired by and in harmony with such belief in the pregnant utterance: 'he that doeth truth cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God[2].' As it has been pointedly said: 'it is precisely in John's Gospel that the thoroughly practical spirit of early Christianity makes itself felt most powerfully; the Word has become true man, as such he has revealed the Father, together with the revelation of the Truth (that is, the moral being of God) he has also taught men to do the Truth—that is, to follow the Will of God, to love God, and to love the brethren also[3].' And again, a 'thoroughly practical Christianity' is 'mirrored' in the Fourth Gospel[4].

Yet it is a question whether considerations such as these, however weighty they may be and are, adequately account for features which stare one in the face; 'say what we will about differences of audience and of situation demanding different forms of address, and allowing for exceptional instances, the contrast between the terse axiomatic sayings, the simple parables of the Synoptics, and the elaborate arguments of the Johannine discourses, is too great to be explained away[5].'

[1] 'My own general impression, without asserting an early date for the Fourth Gospel, is that that Gospel enshrines a genuine tradition of an aspect of Jesus' teaching which has not found a place in the Synoptics,' Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, p. 12. And see this scholar's remarks in *CBE*, p. 181. Yet, as Cohu (*op. cit.* pp. 453 ff.) shrewdly remarks, the one discourse singled out in our Gospel as a 'hard saying' was 'delivered, not to Jerusalem scribes or Pharisees, but to Galilaean multitudes.' On the significance of σκληρός (Jn vi, 60) see Oort, *op. cit.* p. 530. Spitta's manipulation (*op. cit.* pp. xx ff., 133 ff.) of the entire chapter, by the way, is interesting.

[2] Jn iii, 21. 'Right action is right thought realized,' Westcott, *St John's Gosp. in loc.*

[3] von Dobschütz, *Das Apos. Zeitalter*, pp. 68 f.

[4] von Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Prim. Church*, p. 231. And thus Wetzel (*NKZ*, xiv, p. 674): 'An klaren, aufs Praktische und Sittliche gerichteten Stücken fehlt es auch im Ev. Joh. nicht.' Of the contrary opinion Schwalb, *op. cit.* pp. 258 f.

[5] J. H. Bernard, *Church Congress* (1903) *Paper.*

The contrast is sharp. It is recorded of the Synoptic Jesus that men 'heard him gladly[1],' and small wonder that they did so when, 'being so much in earnest with the matter, he had in a unique degree the manner at command[2]'; of the Johannine Christ it was reported that 'never man so spake[3],' and the phrase, scarcely explained by the context, has been regarded as generally significant of abstruseness in the matter and manner of his discourse[4]. In the one case he so speaks as to attract and often win sympathy; in the other he talks above people's heads[5], he positively invites misunderstanding: 'there is an argumentativeness, a tendency to mystification, about the utterances of the Johannine Christ which ...is positively repellent...it is quite inconceivable that the historic Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels could have argued and quibbled with opponents as He is represented to have done in the Fourth Gospel.' 'He exasperates the Jews[6].'

Not so spoke Jesus of Nazareth. And besides; 'In the Johannine discourses...we feel that it is not the visible and audible Jesus who is speaking, but the Christ who is the life of the Church[7]'; and the only possible explanation is that the Fourth Gospel 'is not history, but something else cast in an historical form[8].' The real hearers of the Johannine Christ, it might be truly said, are the readers of the Fourth Gospel[9].

[1] Mk i, 22; xii, 37.

[2] See the fine passage in which Bousset (*Jesus*, E. T. pp. 36 ff.) treats of Jesus as 'Master of the parable'; also Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 75. But see also Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism*, pp. 90 ff.

[3] Jn vii, 46.

[4] The saying Mk iv, 11 ff., probably inapt in regard to the parables, might be much to the point if applied to some of the Johannine discourses.

[5] Thus when (Jn iv, 29), holding converse with the Samaritan woman, he treats of spiritual worship and a universal religion, while the one thing that impresses her is that he, a stranger, knows all about her private life. See Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 72; Percy Gardner, *op. cit.* pp. 112 ff. Otherwise Herder (*op. cit.* p. 318), who, with allusion to the discourses generally, says: 'ein unbefangenes Weib, eine Samariterin, verstand sie besser als zu Jerusalem die Rabbinen und Schriftgelehrten.' But see Alex. Schweizer, *op. cit.* p. 43.

[6] Burkitt, *Gospel Hist.* pp. 227 f. 'Jésus lui-même parle une langue philosophique, inintelligible pour ses auditeurs,' Réville, *op. cit.* p. 299. And see Oort, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

[7] Percy Gardner, *op. cit.* pp. 115 f.

[8] Burkitt, *ib.*

[9] 'Der 4te Evangelist,' wrote Schwalb (*op. cit.* p. 194), 'versteht ganz gründlich die Reden Jesu, denn grösstentheils hat er sie selbst erdacht.'

VI. The Synoptic and Johannine portraits of Jesus. It is here contended that there is no escape from a categorical 'either—or': if the one be true to life, the other most certainly is not; the sharp contrast, it is said, is reducible to 'the simple formula: here man—there God[1].' While the Synoptic Jesus 'advances practically nothing as to his divine nature, and judging from his utterances, solely holds himself endowed with divine gifts, sent by God, Messiah,' the Johannine Christ 'makes everything turn on himself, pre-existence is claimed, one with God he has shared the divine glory, he had come down from heaven in all the plenitude of divine knowledge and might, he is about to return speedily to the throne on high[2].' Therein speaks the criticism of a century ago; in like manner that of more recent times: never does the Synoptic Jesus 'step outside the bounds of the purely human[3]'; as for the Christ of the Fourth Evangelist, he is 'complete from the outset, for Him there is neither childhood nor youth, He is throughout the divine word manifested in the flesh[4].' And so again, when it is said that in the Fourth Gospel...we have 'a version—or perversion—of the Master's life by a disciple who has portrayed him, not in his self-sacrificing love,...but as the mighty superhuman being demanding recognition of the divine Sonship and Messianic glory[5].'

We will make some independent study of the two portraits.

He who looks down from the Synoptic canvas is assuredly true man. To drop metaphor, the Jesus of at any rate the Marcan representation has already reached manhood when he comes on the scene, and it is clear from the manner of the allusions that he shares the experiences which are common to the race. He is conscious of physical needs; the strain of continued action tells on

[1] Wernle, *op. cit.* p. 25.
[2] Bretschneider, *op. cit.* p. 2.
[3] Bousset, *Jesus*, p. 98.
[4] H. J. Holtzmann, *Einl.* p. 432.
[5] Weinel, *St Paul the Man and his Work*, p. 320. See further Soltau, *Unsere Evangelien*, p. 111; von Soden, *op. cit.* p. 393; Wrede, *op. cit.* pp. 31, 37; Scholten, *Het Evan. naar Joh.* p. 216; Réville, *Le Quatrième Év.* pp. 299 f.; Loisy, *op. cit.* pp. 72 f. Let it be remarked that, where there is inability to recognize the historic Jesus in the Fourth Gospel representation, stress is often laid on the supreme claims of him who is 'leader to God for every period and for every people' (Bousset, *op. cit.* pp. 102 f.; cf. Wernle, *op. cit.* p. 1) to the reverence and devotion of mankind.

him; stirred by emotions manifold he is moved to compassion by the spectacle of suffering and pain[1]; he both wins and displays affection; capable of sternness he gives vent to wrath. Rebuff astonishes him, and he finds himself powerless to act[2]; he disclaims omniscience; if he puts questions it is because he has need to be informed. Great spiritual crises are experienced by him, and the meaning of temptation is realized to the full[3]. He cannot do without prayer; hence, seeking strength, he goes apart to be alone with God. Yet strength fails him; in Gethsemane deep terror seizes him, and he pleads as hoping for deliverance to the last. Bitter is the cry wrung from him in his dying moments.

There is more to be said. The Jesus who looms large in the Marcan Gospel is exceptionally great. Wondrous is the influence exerted by him; stir and movement follow in his path; and burst of enthusiasm or outbreak of hostility is equally significant of a forcefulness of personality which is realized quite as much by enemies as by friends. His 'come ye after me' is no sooner heard than obeyed; unclean spirits are subdued at a word; his fame spreads, and, seek privacy though he may, he is sought out and found by the crowd. He holds his hearers spell-bound by the manner and the matter of his teaching. Himself full of God-consciousness he makes God a reality; he ever seeks to 'call into life in the souls of others the treasures of His own soul[4].' Persuaded of a God-entrusted mission, he spends himself heroically in the discharge of duty. 'His Passion and his Death are in truth his Coronation[5].'

Yet more must be said. Great with no ordinary greatness the Marcan Jesus is evidently more than mere man. If on the one hand he takes his stand on the side of humanity, so, on the other hand, he appears to range himself over against men in virtue of

[1] Here, perhaps, there is a reminder of a line in Goethe's *Faust*: 'Der Menschheit ganzer Jammer fasst mich an.'

[2] 'The Jesus of Mark is a man with a man's wrath and disappointment,' Estlin Carpenter, *First Three Gospels*, p. 217.

[3] See in this connexion Heb. ii, 18.

[4] von Soden, *op. cit.* p. 3. And see Wernle, *op. cit.* p. 30; Arno Neumann, *Jesus*, p. 76. As another writer has said: 'He knew the Father as none else did, and He had the power of conveying this knowledge to others through His own personality.'

[5] Bousset, *Jesus*, p. 110.

a relationship to God[1]. It may well be the case that, 'straitened' in his earthly life[2], he is an enigma to himself; yet he positively affirms his divine origin[3] and Sonship[4]. He asserts his sovereignty. He is persuaded that he can forgive sins. His own importance is clear to him, and he accentuates it; allegiance to his person is insisted on by him; he is conscious of an authority which is not of man. His 'I say unto you' is deeply significant; his own utterances are regarded by him as of transcendent and eternal weight and import. The designation 'the Christ, the Son of the Blessed,' is accepted by him. That, not mere man, he is removed above the angels he says plainly[5]; and, if in the same connexion he subordinates himself to God, it is noteworthy that, in another saying which may be genuine in his lips, he can speak of the Father and of himself in the same breath[6]. The very fact that an Apocalyptic phrase is occasionally adopted, and, albeit not without ambiguity, applied by him to himself, is eminently suggestive; superhuman that he knows himself to be, he is, or is destined to be revealed as, the glorious, pre-existent Son of Man[7].

What if allowance must be made for some repainting and gilding which is ultimately traceable to the Church's faith[8]? True, no doubt, that even the earliest Evangelist sets out from an already definite Christology[9]; the one point here is that he who is subject of the Synoptic portrait is exalted above purely human greatness. In his majesty he is unique[10]. An impression, it is said, is conveyed that 'the relation in which he stood to God was not only different in degree from that in which we stand, but also unique in kind[11].'

[1] Barth, *op. cit.* p. 256.

[2] Lk. xii, 50. See Scott (*The Kingdom and the Messiah*, pp. 228 ff.) for some excellent remarks on the significance of συνέχομαι.

[3] Mk i, 38 (cf. Lk. iv, 43). The allusion may, however, be simply to a departure from the house.

[4] Mk i, 11. An experience doubtless personal to himself.

[5] Mk xiii, 32. [6] Mt. xxiii, 9 f.

[7] A few of the above sentences are adapted from my *Eschatology of Jesus*, pp. 324 ff. [8] Bousset, *Jesus*, pp. 89 f.

[9] J. Weiss, *Christus*, p. 74. The allusion being to Mark, Wrede (*Messiasgeheimnis*, p. 125) says with truth: 'Denn das leidet keinen Zweifel, sein Zweck war ja eben der, Jesus mit seiner Schrift als Sohn Gottes zu schildern und zu erweisen.' [10] Cf. Beyschlag, *N.T. Theology*, i, p. 75.

[11] Lotze, *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 172. Otherwise Raven, *op. cit.* p. 188:

'The Synoptic picture of Christ,' so it has been said[1], 'is the finest flower of religious poetry.' To turn from it to the portrait of the Johannine Christ.

A portrait of 'sweet, unearthly beauty[2]' as it has been called, it is certainly of an exalted personage. There is an air of imperiousness about the Christ of our Evangelist, as, issuing his commands, he expects obedience from those who are rather summoned as his subjects than invited as his friends[3]. The multitudes are eager to make him a King; precisely because they own him a force to be reckoned with, his destruction is compassed by his foes. His discourse is of high matters, and it is with conscious dignity that he refers to himself. Majestic is the part played by him in the closing scenes; whether in the Garden, in the high priest's court or in the Praetorium his mien is stately and his speech serene. He 'decides His own fate[4].'

But the Johannine representation does not stop short here; on the contrary, it is plain that the regal personage depicted transcends mere manhood. He manifests a celestial glory. He knows all men as knowing what is in man. If he tell of heavenly things it is as having seen and known them; he has come down from heaven, and thither he will soon return. He can say: 'My Father worketh hitherto and I work'; if eternal life be for him knowledge of 'the only true God,' it is equally to know himself; dishonour done to him is dishonour done to God; with deliberation does he say; 'The Father is in me and I in him'; recognizing a distinction, he affirms that he and the Father are 'one.' Preexistent as he claims to be, he is conceived of as 'the Word' that was with God from all eternity; and the very climax is reached with the great confession in any case reminiscent of the very first sentence of the Gospel: 'My Lord and my God.'

Yet other features are discernible; and they are such as to

'A Christ who differs from us in kind is, however much we may try to disguise the fact by talking vaguely about impersonal humanity, simply not man at all.'

[1] By Brandt. [2] von Soden, *op. cit.* p. 416.

[3] Cf. *Ecce Homo* (20th ed.), p. 67.

[4] Jülicher, *Einl.* p. 358. 'Die Kraft, durch eigenen Willen und eigene That in den Tod zu gehen, bildet Jesu Herrlichkeit,' Lütgert, *Die Joh. Christologie* (1st ed.), p. 90.

suggest that this 'King of men,' in all his superhuman royalty, is, after all, true man. Manhood is expressly affirmed of him in the Prologue, nor yet there only; elsewhere touches are met with which are a revelation of the humanity he wears. He is spoken of as 'a man'; he companies with 'his mother and his brethren'; his 'father and mother[1],' it is said without demur, are known. Because 'wearied with his journey' he is fain to rest and to ask for water from the well. Strong attachments are formed by him. He knows what it is to be glad, while a groan of mingled wrath and anguish comes from him in the presence of bereavement and of death. By implication he realizes the need of prayer; is he not confident that he is always heard[2]? There are moments when he is 'troubled in the spirit,' albeit the conjecture is precarious that he pleads for deliverance from his impending fate[3]. Protesting his innocence, he stands on his defence. 'The keen expression of

[1] The allusion raises the 'perennial question' of the 'Virgin-birth.' From the silence of Mark and of the Pauline Epistles, it would seem that the doctrine formed no part of the earliest *stratum* of Apostolic teaching. Ultimately traceable to the sources of the opening chapters of Matt. and Luke, it would be known to our Evangelist, for he was acquainted with the Synoptic Gospels. His own silence is explained in two ways: he deems it unneccessary to repeat what is already well-known and accepted; he deliberately brushes the Nativity stories aside. According to O. Holtzmann (*Das Johannesevangelium*, p. 47) he agrees with the opponents of Jesus that Joseph is really the earthly father of Jesus; according to Zahn (*Einl.* ii, pp. 504 f.) he so portrays the origin of the children of God (Jn i, 13) after the pattern picture of the origin of the only Son of God who is such in the fullest sense that his readers will be at once reminded of a begetting and a birth without carnal impulse and will of man. It is allowed by Baldensperger (*Der Prolog*, pp. 28, 123) that the Johannine theology is by no means incompatible with representations having their basis in the Virgin-birth. But see Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des* 4. *Evglm.* pp. 330 ff. This, however, is not the place for any lengthy discussion of the 'difficult and anxious question,' yet let the following sentences be quoted: 'There have been saintly and profound Christian intellects who have confessed that the statement in St Matthew almost repels them. No one can say that of St John's infinitely higher and truer idea of the Incarnation' (Cohu, *op. cit.* p. 439. See also Ammon, *op. cit.* i, p. 77; Herder, *op. cit.* pp. 264 ff.). In any case Joseph would be regarded as the legal father of Jesus (Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, pp. 318 f.).

[2] 'Es ist eine Entstellung des Gedankens wenn man von einem "Scheingebet" redet,' Lütgert, *Die Joh. Christologie* (1st ed.), p. 34.

[3] Jn xii, 27. See Westcott, *St John*, p. 182; Oberney, *Der Gottesbrunnen der Menschheit*, p. 116.

bodily exhaustion[1]' is discovered in his almost dying words; and if that be really so the 'sour wine' offered by men whose mockery has been exchanged for pity is 'received' as sorely needed by his tortured human frame. But this is doubtful[2].

We conclude that there is something lacking in the descriptions instanced at the outset of the portrait of the Johannine Christ; in that, justly accentuating the divinity which radiates from it, they disallow the humanity on which, in his own way, our Evangelist insists[3].

It must nevertheless be frankly conceded that, while there are resemblances and common features, the two portraits, in respect of style and colouring and of lights and shades, are diverse in type. Their subject is, no doubt, the same, yet it is treated differently; and of the two artists, representative of two painter-schools, the one is an adept at drawing graphic sketches, while the *forte* of the other lies in painting 'soul-portraits[4].' To drop metaphor; as for the Synoptists, their thoughts are for the most part—not by any means exclusively—concentrated on the earthly Jesus as he 'went about doing good'; as for the Fourth Evangelist, he writes as having sought to penetrate into the inmost soul of the Jesus of his spiritual vision. 'Who would not confess that in his sweet unearthly picture he has given us the true religious import of that sacred Life[5]?'

In fine. The 'simple formula: here man—there God' will scarcely work. The Synoptic Jesus is, in any case, more than one who towers above his fellow-men. The features of a true humanity are not entirely absent from the Johannine Christ if they be far less conspicuous than those which tell of the divine[6].

[1] Westcott, *St John*, p. 277.

[2] See Percy Gardner, *op. cit.* p. 304. W. M. Pryke (*Mod. Churchman*, vii, p. 223) points out that 'the "I thirst" is spoken only that the scripture might be fulfilled.'

[3] 'Im Johannesevangelium wird auf die volle Menschheit Jesu überall Gewicht gelegt.' Oberhey, *op. cit.* p. 111. And see Réville, *op. cit.* pp. 329 f.; J. Weiss, *Christus*, p. 85; Lütgert, *op. cit.* p. 70; Percy Gardner, *op. cit.* pp. 79 f.; Calmes, *op. cit.* p. 64.

[4] Angus Mackay, *A reasonable Faith*, pp. 102 f.

[5] von Soden, *op. cit.* p. 417. Cf. Schenkel, *op. cit.* p. 25.

[6] 'Still, on the whole, the λόγος predominates over the σάρξ in this

To bring this chapter to a close with a rapid summary of conclusions which are suggested by the comparison between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics which has now been instituted; and in so doing to dwell yet again on the fact that strong preferences for the Synoptic representation are not of necessity incompatible with unfeigned acceptance of what is held to be a cardinal doctrine of the Christian faith. Let it further be remembered that the Gospels one and all were 'written by living men whose life entered into their writings,' and that the 'colour and temper' of the mind of each several author would naturally be reflected by his work[1]. Diversity of individuality must accordingly be allowed for; that the Evangelists should tell their story each one in his own way and that the ground traversed should not in every case be the same, is only what might be expected[2].

It must nevertheless be owned that a contrast is presented which finds no sufficient explanation in any natural diversity as between man and man. It admits, perhaps, of reduction; for, the question being of chronology and scene, it, speaking generally, has perhaps been exaggerated if discrepancies remain; looking to the Baptist-representations, it is plain that they are of the self-same great personage, if in course of time necessity has arisen for drawing distinctions between John and Jesus. It is far from being confined to the mere correction 'in a delicate manner,' of 'the

Evangelist's presentation of the life of Christ' says Johnston (*op. cit.* p. 43). 'Der Logos ward Fleisch, aber nicht Mensch' is the formula by which Schwalb (*op. cit.* pp. 215 f.) abides. Or, as Schmiedel (*Das Vierte Evglm.* p. 122) puts it: 'Ihn zieht nur das Göttliche an.' See also Brückner, *op. cit.* p. 86; Hennell, *op. cit.* p. 112; Forbes, *op. cit.* p. 161; De Wette, *op. cit.* ii, p. 216. And thus Herder (*op. cit.* p. 379): the Evangelist 'vergass, wenn ich so sagen darf, das Irdische seines palästinischen, an Ort und Zeit gebundenen Freundes, um das Himmlische, das Ewige in ihm darzustellen.' It must further be remembered that there is no room for the temptation in the Johannine conception; and Ballenstedt's remarks on the question (*op. cit.* pp. 67, 73) are decidedly interesting, see also Cohu, *op. cit.* p. 400.

[1] Newman Smyth, *Old faiths in new Light*, p. 26.

[2] Munger (*Freedom of Faith*, p. 16) aptly writes: 'However the Spirit of God may have used for His higher purposes the minds of men, He did not overpower their natural habits of expression, or hold individual genius passive in the grasp of His Almighty hand.'

faults of his predecessors[1]' by one who—from whatever quarter—may have 'heard many details of the life of Jesus[2],' and who, on some points at all events, may have had more accurate knowledge at his command[3]. It is both marked and significant in regard to the miraculous. When every allowance has been made for powers of adaptation and varied environment, it is impossible to believe that the historic Jesus was really accustomed to discourse after the manner of the Johannine Christ. The former lives and moves in the Synoptic Gospels; as for the latter, the human lineaments notwithstanding, he is pre-eminently the Christ of experience, the life of the Church[4].

The modern student cannot but feel that to turn from the Synoptics to the Fourth Gospel is to breathe another atmosphere, to be transported to another world[5]. The contrast is, indeed, sharp; and it may well have been the case that men looked askance at 'John's' Gospel when first it came into their hands, and that it was slow to win its way to general recognition and acceptance[6].

'Another world.' The world, to a certainty, of Greek life and thought[7]; the world of Asia Minor, of Ephesus. But to what particular period in the history of the world? In other words, is help forthcoming from our Gospel which shall enable us to speak more definitely in regard to its date?

To that question we will address ourselves in the next chapter.

[1] Michaelis, *Introd. to N.T.* i, p. 95.

[2] Percy Gardner, *op. cit.* p. 87.

[3] In particular of the closing days of our Lord's earthly life.

[4] 'Le quatrième évangéliste a été le Platon de son Socrate, non le Xénophon,' Réville, *op. cit.* p. 335 So at an earlier date Bleek, cited by Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 41; see also Lange, *op. cit.* p. 22. The analogy, not, of course, to be pressed, is admirably discussed by Percy Gardner, *op. cit.* pp. 101 ff.

[5] So Calmes (*op. cit.* p. 1), A R. Loman (*Het Evan. van Joh. naar Oorsprong, Bestemming, en Gebruik in de Oudheid*, p. 5), and many others.

[6] 'Il est fort probable qu'au début son œuvre ne dut satisfaire personne,' Réville, *op. cit.* p. 330, cf. p. 65.

[7] 'Sodann stehen wir auf griechischem Boden, es umgibt uns griechische Luft,' Wernle, *op. cit.* p. 28.

CHAPTER VI

THE SELF-DATING OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

It has already been decided by us, of course provisionally, that the two extreme limits within which the date of origination of our Gospel might be held to lie were roughly indicated by, on the one hand, that of the latest of the Synoptics, and, on the other, by its use, to all appearance, in the circles of Valentinian Gnosis.

Our provisional decision, it must be remembered, was the outcome of an inquiry which was then restricted to the field of external evidence. Not so in the present chapter, for it now becomes our business to question the Gospel itself; to determine so far as possible the relations in which it stands to event, circumstance, or movement in the outer world. And in so doing we shall speedily be told that, instead of finding a *terminus ad quem* in the year A.D. 135 or thereabouts, we must be content to assign our Gospel to a later date.

We will arrange our subject under separate heads. And first:

The revolt of Bar Cochba. It was in the year A.D. 132 that the whole of Palestine was roused against Roman domination by a Pseudo-Messiah; whether Simon was his real name or not, he is known by an epithet which, in one of the forms of its transmission means 'Son of a Star[1].' The insurrection headed by him—it meant terrible sufferings endured by the Palestinian Christians for their refusal to have part or lot in it—blazed fiercely for three years; then it was stamped out ruthlessly by the Roman arms. As we read in Eusebius[2], the author of the Jewish madness met his fate at the fortress of Bitthera—some dozen miles S.W. of Jerusalem—in the eighteenth year (A.D. 134–135) of the reign of Hadrian.

The plea is raised that our Gospel must be dated within, if not later than, the period A.D. 132–135, inasmuch as there is a clear

[1] On this point, and for further details relative to the pretender, see *RGG*, i, col. 915.

[2] *HE*, iv, 6.

reference to this false Messiah in words placed by the Evangelist (v, 43) in the lips of his Christ: 'if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive.'

A view which, comparatively modern, has found confident adoption or qualified support[1], while hints are met with that, whereas the Synoptic allusions[2] are explicitly to false Christs destined to arise, the manner of the Johannine representation suggests personages not only come already but actually known to those who read[3]. The question is, however, not of a plurality; and, if an individual be really intended, the allusion is both vague and hypothetical. The 'if' (ἐὰν ἄλλος ἔλθῃ) is surely tell-tale[4]; and although it may not positively exclude the view that (let alone the Antichrist of patristic interpretation) some given personage was in contemplation, it certainly militates, and forcibly, against that which contends for any given accomplished fact. Nor is it unlikely that the Saying instanced, reminiscent of Deut. xviii, 20[5], speaks generally and with bitter irony[6], of all eager running after false Messiahs who shall come at their own instance, and without any commission from the Father[7].

[1] Schmiedel (*Evglm.... des Joh.* pp. 25) would hesitate to rely on such a point taken by itself, yet he finds justification in other grounds suggestive of the period A.D. 132–135. More decidedly Lützelberger, *op. cit.* p. 271. 'In Vers 43,' says Wellhausen (*Das Evglm. Joh.* p. 27), 'erkennt man mit recht eine Weissagung auf Barkochba.' If the question be of a definite personage (and not of false prophets and false Christs generally as in Mk xiii, 6, 21, 22 = Mt. xxiv, 5, 23, 24; Acts v, 36 f.) then, says Holtzmann (*HCNT*, iv, p. 99) 'entweder der persönliche Antichrist oder irgend eine geschichtliche Persön lichkeit...dann doch wohl eher der einzige geschichtliche Judenmessias Bar Kochba als Simon Magus.' See also W. Bauer, *HBNT*, II. ii. p. 62 Pfleiderer decided for 'the Son of a Star' (cf. Numb. xxiv, 17), and Thoma for Simon Magus. But, as is pointed out by Loisy (*op. cit.* p. 416), the latter was not a false Messiah for the Jews.

[2] For the refs. see the preceding note. No fewer than sixty-four such Messiahs, it is said, are enumerated by Jewish historians.

[3] Cf. Réville, *op. cit.* p. 170.

[4] 'La particule conditionelle exclut plutôt l'idée d'un fait précis,' Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 416. To the same effect B. Weiss, *Das Johannesevglm.* p. 106, note; Clemen, *Entstehung des Johannesevglm.* p. 147.

[5] So Spitta, *Das Johannesevglm.* pp. 131, 133.

[6] Heitmüller, *SNT*, ii, p. 771.

[7] McClymont, St John (*Century Bible*), p. 173. 'Pfleiderer's conclusion that Jn. v, 43 refers to Barkochba and the Jewish rebellion of 132–135,' says

A second contention points to one who, placed by the Fathers within the ranks of Gnosticism, is now allowed by many to have played a more independent rôle, and this was Marcion. Already a Christian when, having left his native Pontus, he (A.D. 139) arrived at Rome, he was excommunicated six years later on the ground of heresy. An ultra-Paulinist as he has been described, he appears to have been without any original design of sectarian action, while zealous for the purging of the Church from what for him were its Judaisms. As things turned out he proceeded to form separate Marcionite communities[1].

Now it has been said that it was the set purpose of our Evangelist so 'to prevent the triumph of Judaistic reaction' by his Gospel as to save Marcion and the followers of Marcion for his comprehensive Church[2].

The suggestion is not uninteresting. Our Gospel is certainly characterized by liberalizing tendencies; it illustrates attempts both to free the Church from distinctively Jewish-Christian survivals and to extend the Church's borders. Yet we seek in vain in it for anything in the shape of proof that its author was up in arms for the defence of any one person, or groups of persons, in particular; in his inclusiveness his thoughts take far wider range; nowhere is there any special indication of a paramount desire to win back persons or parties such as those in question. And besides; albeit the Gospel-Canon in Marcion's day was not the fixed quantity which it had become by the end of the second century, it is nevertheless highly significant that Tertullian could unhesitatingly charge the former with having rejected three Gospels and mutilated the Gospel which he thought fit to retain[3]. The balance weighs down in favour of the view that our Gospel was already in existence; and, if actually known to Marcion—and, it would appear

Forbes (*op. cit.* p. 165), 'will be shared by few.' Gillis P:son Wetter ('*Der Sohn Gottes*,' p. 167) is of the same mind

[1] *RGG*, iv, col. 143 f.; i, col. 1103. See also the chapter on Marcion in Burkitt's *Gospel History and its Transmission*.

[2] 'Om dezen nu te behouden voor de Kerk en de zegepraal der Joodsche reactie te voorkomen doet onze schrijver in zijn Evangelie een welsprekend beroep op den Christus wiens heerlijkheid hij aanschouwt in den geest,' W. F. Loman, *op. cit.* p. 25.

[3] *Adv. Marc.*

that it was so known[1]—there might be ground for surprise that, looking to the nature of its contents, it was not preferred by him to that Gospel which he mutilated[2], viz. Luke.

We will next ask whether any nearer date for its origination is determinable from the manner of its allusions to the Baptist.

Unquestionably our Evangelist is not without Baptist-disciples in his mind. Much more in his mind, however, are the Jews of his own day; his aggressiveness is therein displayed that he joins issue with a hostile Judaism in its arguments from the priority of John to Jesus: in so far as he takes account of men whose staunch allegiance to the Baptist remained unshaken, he is far more nearly concerned to conciliate and to win them. If he be author of the first Johannine Epistle it might appear further (1 Jn v, 6) that he is also 'attempting to counteract the spread of certain erroneous opinions' which were in some way connected with existing Baptist sects[3]. And of the members of such sects it is not unsafe to say that the attitude assumed by them was no longer that of the evidently receptive minds instanced Acts xix, 1 f., nor could the case be one of individuals, Acts xviii, 26, of like type to the Alexandrian Apollos.

It were wise to content ourselves with having raised the question. No answer is forthcoming from the mere fact of the hostility of Judaism. As for Baptist-sects, there is evidence of their survival[4] in a variety of shades and colours; but of clear proof that at any given date they had become special cause of anxiety at Ephesus to our Evangelist there is none whatever.

Let us glance at the Ebionites. The question here is said to be[5] of Jewish Christianity in two tendencies or parties which, alike in their assertion of the permanent obligation of the Mosaic law, in this respect differed that in the one case some liberty was extended to Gentile converts, while in the other case there was a flat denial

[1] Whether, as Zahn (*Gesch. des NT. Kanons*, i, 2, p. 677) urges, he actually borrowed from it is not easy to determine.

[2] See on the whole question Loisy, *op. cit.* pp. 16 f. It may be added that the Prologue of our Gospel is conclusive against one main Marcionite contention.

[3] Alban Blakiston, *op. cit.* p. 136. See the whole chapter for some account of 'the growth of the Baptist sect.'

[4] Lützelberger (*op. cit.* p. 275) discovers them in Parthia.

[5] So, generally, Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.*, i, pp. 120 ff.

of the virgin-birth and of the divinity of Jesus. They are met with in their respective groupings and variously designated[1], at a day long after that to which it is, in any case, needful to assign our Gospel; it cannot be said, however, that assistance is rendered by them in our search. What can, of course, be said is that, in his attitude to legalism pure and simple, our Evangelist is of Paul's mind; that, be his view of the manner of the Incarnation what it may, he has a ready challenge for all who reject the divinity of his Lord[2].

Already brought into contact with the syncretism of the period, we here turn for a moment to the reforming movement known as Montanism, with its assertion that the age of the Paraclete began, and reached its fullest developement, with Montanus[3]. A suggestion, then, is that our Evangelist, in respect of his doctrinal system, is himself a borrower from Montanism; and that consequently the date of his Gospel cannot be earlier than the last decade of the second century[4]. But the case is assuredly the other way about[5]; and, the suggestion dismissed by us, we go on our way.

We now address ourselves more particularly to one of 'the two main tendencies in the early Church which lie near the main current of its historic developement[6],' viz. Gnosticism.

It is, of course, impossible in these pages to treat in detail of successive stages in and the many phases of—to repeat from a previous chapter—'the boldest and grandest syncretism the world has ever beheld,' and nothing more shall be attempted than a very general and bare outline of Gnosticism in its leading features. Of the Gnostic sects it has been said that they 'were the result of the

[1] For Origen all Jewish Christians were Ἐβριωναῖοι, yet he differentiated between διττοὶ and ἀμφότεροι Ἐβριωναῖοι. Jerome, followed by Augustine and Theodoret, termed the more moderate party Nazareans, the term Ebionites being reserved for the extremists. But see on the whole question of Ebionism, Bethune-Baker, *Christian Doctrine*, pp. 63 ff.

[2] De Wette, *op. cit.* ii, p. 219.

[3] Montanus made his appearance at Pepuza in Phrygia. The exact date is variously estimated; *ca.* A.D. 152–170. For an account of the movement of which he was a prophet see *RGG*, iv, col. 482 f.; Kurtz, *op. cit.* i, pp. 225 ff.

[4] See Scholten, *op. cit.* p. 465; Schwegler, *op. cit.* pp. 204 ff.

[5] De Wette, *op. cit.* ii, p. 226.

[6] v. Dobschütz, *Christ. Life in the Prim. Church*, p. xxxiii.

contact of Christian principles with the current ideas of the first century,' every Gnostic system being 'an attempt to blend Christianity with the theosophical speculations of the age'; 'in a sense, however, Gnosticism is more ancient than the Church, being a philosophy of religion which seeks in the end to explain every cultus'; it is then suggested that 'the great test to which primitive Christianity was exposed from the outside world was not so much the danger of succumbing to persecution, as of adapting itself to the popular philosophies of the heathen and Jewish world[1].' That truths, or elements of truth, are perceptible in Gnostic doctrines no one would venture to deny; at the same time they are adumbrated and distorted by what was a main principle with the 'intellectualism' so pre-eminently characteristic of Gnosticism, the belief that matter is essentially evil in itself. Some qualification is, perhaps, necessary; there is nevertheless truth in the remark: 'Herein lies the inherent weakness of Gnostic systems; they strike at the root of all morality, by denying that man in his state of material existence is responsible for his sins, which they assert are not the result of his free choice, but the inevitable consequences of the state in which he is placed[2].' In practice a result, in some quarters, was of two sorts; on the one hand a resort to asceticism as the means of keeping the essentially evil body in subjection, on the other no restraint whatever was exercised, as the evil body with its evil desires was held to be beneath contempt[3]. As the principle was pressed to its logical conclusion, it was maintained that by no possibility could a world essentially evil be the creation of the supreme Deity[4]; and hence the work of creation was referred

[1] Foakes-Jackson, *Hist. of the Christ. Church*, p. 122. The whole chapter should be read. See more particularly Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.* pp. 76 ff. See also the further remarks of v. Dobschütz, *op. cit.*; Kurtz, *Church Hist.* i, pp. 66 f., 98 ff.; *RGG*, ii, col. 1486 ff.; Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*; P. Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur*.

[2] Foakes-Jackson, *op. cit.* p. 129; see foot-note on p. 128 of that work for an apt citation from v. Dobschütz: 'Gnosticism is, in the first place, intellectualism; one-sided over-valuation of knowledge at the expense of moral activity.'

[3] He who was redeemed—and theories of redemption played no inconsiderable part in Gnostic systems—might conceive himself to be above and beyond Good and Evil.

[4] Who is, in many cases, not so much the God of the prophets and of

to an inferior being, while it was argued that of communication between the supreme God and the material evil world there could be none whatever. Intermediate agencies, aeons, emanations of the Deity, were accordingly conceived of. The conception being scouted that the highest of the emanations of the Father could take upon himself a material body, there came flat denials of the reality of the Incarnation, protests, in many forms, against the true humanity, the real suffering, of Jesus; in a word Docetism. There was indeed, so it was allowed by some, a man Jesus upon whom the superior aeon Christ had descended at the Baptism, but only to desert him at the Crucifixion; others, again, alleged that it was really Simon the Cyrenian who was crucified and by mistake, while the real Jesus looked on and smiled. Whatever the explanations offered, they alike show 'how rooted was the idea that God could not possibly have anything to do immediately with matter, or with the sufferings of a material universe; if He seemed to make such contact, it was only in appearance. The suffering Christ was a phantom; not a hair of his head was touched, let alone a bone being broken[1].'

Now, there are clear indications of the spread of more or less developed Gnostic tendencies both in the admittedly genuine Pauline Epistles and in those which may or may not be traceable to Paul himself[2]. Thus in the case of the Colossian heresy, which has 'been pronounced to contain all the essential elements of a Gnostic system'; the situation is less clear in the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians, yet there are hints at errors similar to those which prevailed at the neighbouring Colosse; as for the Pastoral Epistles, they suggest that need had arisen at Ephesus to deal with the question of asceticism and to draw plain distinctions between true knowledge and knowledge which is 'falsely so called.' Nor is there

Jesus, as the First Cause, the Absolute to whom no predicates could be attached, the Ineffable One.

[1] Rendel Harris, *Newly-Recovered Gospel of St Peter*, p. 29. And see pp. 45, 47, for striking instances of the Docetic character of the Pseudo-Gospel: 'he' (i.e. Jesus on the Cross) 'was silent, as if in no wise feeling pain'; 'And the Lord cried out, saying, My Power, My Power, hast thou forsaken Me?'

[2] For the refs. see Foakes-Jackson, *op. cit.* pp. 129 ff.

room for doubt that, whether he be Paul or not, the author of the Epistles to Timothy was confronted with, at all events, the germs of Docetism when, 1 Tim. iii, 16, he points emphatically to Jesus as 'manifested in the flesh.' Yet it must be admitted that, if he really was Paul, he had himself used language in some degree savouring of Docetic tendencies at an earlier period; thus when, Phil. ii, 5 ff., he speaks of 'Christ Jesus' as 'taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.'

We now turn to our Gospel. As we have seen already, it was not only commented on by the Gnostic Heracleon, but held in estimation by Basilides; and, such being the case, we may well be incredulous in respect of the very late dating of a previous suggestion. But the question is whether we be now pointed to the nearer date sought for by the manner and matter of its contents when compared with that Gnosticism which has been rapidly surveyed by us.

There are two extreme positions. In the one case our Gospel has been definitely claimed for Gnosticism[1]; in the other it is said to be characterized throughout by a pronounced antagonism to Gnostic modes of thought. The truth, however, does not appear to lie in either quarter, and it is far more reasonable to decide that, in some degree sympathetic, it also tells plainly of a discriminating mind. That it is not untinged by Gnostic influences might be admitted; its author has occasional resort to a terminology in use in Gnostic circles, he makes room for an 'intellectualism' of a certain kind, elements of dualism are perceptible in his conceptions, the idealized portrait of his Christ is suggestive of a Docetism from which he himself is not altogether free. On the other hand it must be as readily admitted that, by no means blind to momentous issues, he fastens on and repudiates errors detected by him in Gnostic doctrines which were making their appearance in his day. In his own fashion he contends for the real humanity of his Lord[2]. There are terms and expressions, it is argued, which, changing them for others, he significantly declines to im-

[1] It was referred, in antiquity, to Cerinthus.

[2] A case in point is where (Jn xix, 17) he excludes all mention of Simon of Cyrene and says of Jesus: 'bearing the Cross for himself.'

port, at any rate does not import, into his Gospel[1]. It is safe to say that the theory of intermediate emanations is absolutely discarded by him. There is nothing 'one-sided' in the value attached by him to the intellect. The idea of asceticism is not so much foreign to as repulsive to him; he makes no secret of his conviction that right action is contingent on and must attend right thought. Never does he doubt that the God of the Old Testament is identical with the God and Father of Jesus[2].

Our Evangelist is no advanced Gnostic. As for his Gospel, it is not the work of one who, realizing the gravity of the situation, is constrained to grapple with and refute a Gnosticism which has arrived at the hey-day of its developement. What might be allowed perhaps is that, not definitely hostile to Gnosticism in its earlier stages, he occasionally reveals a discriminating sympathy[3]; yet it must be added that, alive to errors creeping in and already fraught with mischief, he is bold to speak his mind. That his Gospel is altogether strange to the Gnostic movement[4] it is hard to believe.

We are led to the conclusion that our Gospel places us in a day when Basilides and Valentinian had yet to elaborate their systems, and that accordingly it is prior to the year A.D. 135 or thereabouts.

By what space of time? If so be that our Evangelist is really the Beloved Disciple, necessity is of course laid upon us to retrace our steps so as to get within a period when he still survived; and in that case we should have to date our Gospel at least as early as a year or two after (if not before) the close of the first century[5].

[1] γνῶσις, πίστις, σοφία. In the first two cases he has resort to the verbal forms γιγνώσκειν, πιστεύειν; in the latter he uses the word ἀλήθεια.

[2] See on the whole question E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel* pp. 87 ff.

[3] Schwegler (*op. cit.* p. 211, note) is far less reserved: 'Dass das Joh. Evglm. von Beziehungen zu den ältesten Systemen der Gnosis durchwoben ist, liegt am Tage.' To the like effect Brückner, *op. cit.* p. 68.

[4] According to Réville (*op. cit.* p. 322) 'Cet Évangile est purement alexandrin; il est encore tout à fait étranger au mouvement gnostique.' The view adopted above is in part similar to that of De Wette, *op. cit.* ii, p. 217.

[5] The Crucifixion is dated *circa* A.D. 29. At that date the Beloved Disciple (if a real person and in any case not the son of Zebedee) may have been quite a young man not to say a youth. Assuming that he actually reached extreme old age, he would be 90 or thereabouts by the year A.D. 100.

Yet, apart from the contingency that, not a real person, he 'represents the Church in its essential idea,' he may be not so much author of as authority for our Gospel; and it may be said at once that it is not absolutely imperative to decide for a date within the life-time of an eye-witness of the life of Jesus. And besides, there are considerations which forbid us to travel very far back in our search. Whatever the identity of the Evangelist, he writes at a date later than the latest of the Synoptics; and here we bear in mind the uncertainty which attaches to the dating of the Matthaean and the Lucan Gospels. The very fact of his dependence on the Synoptics is an argument in favour of the theory that some time had elapsed since their publication. Nor is this all; the world in which he places us is not diverse only in locality, but in conceptions which suggest an after day. The One of whom he tells is not so much the Jesus of the Synoptic representation as the Christ of the experience of his own inmost soul.

Were our search to end at this point the conclusion would be reasonable that, although no precise date can be fixed, our Gospel can be safely assigned to the period A.D. 100–125[2], while it might be not too venturesome to push the later limit somewhat further back[3].

But, unhappily, we may not as yet cry halt. An objection must now be noted which, referring our Gospel to a circle to which Apollinaris[4] had belonged, transfers the date of its origination to a period but shortly antecedent to the celebrated meeting at Rome (*ca.* A.D. 155) of Polycarp and Anicetus[5]. Accordingly we must perplex ourselves, if for a brief space only, with the tangled skein of Quartodecimanism and the Paschal Controversy.

It was remarked in the preceding chapter that there is—or there certainly appears to be—an irreconcilable discrepancy be-

[1] E. F. Scott, *op. cit.* p. 144. And see Appendix ii.

[2] Thus, in italics, Réville (*op. cit.* p. 325): '*la rédaction du iv^e évangile doit être reportée entre l'an* 100 *et* 125 *approximativement.*'

[3] But for the uncertainty relative to our First and Third Gospels the earlier limits might be pushed back to *ca.* A.D. 90.

[4] Claudius Apollinaris, the distinguished Bishop of Hierapolis. Of his numerous writings fragments only are extant. His Apology, it is said, was addressed to Marcus Aurelius.

[5] Schwegler, *op. cit.* pp. 201 ff. See also pp. 191 ff.

tween our Gospel and its three companions in respect of the Death-day of Jesus. According to the Synoptics, the legal Passover is kept by Jesus and his disciples on the evening of the 14th Nisan, and the Crucifixion takes place the day after; otherwise our Evangelist, who is at pains to make it understood that when the Supper of his narrative was held, the Passover lay still ahead; that it was on the 14th, not the 15th, of Nisan that Jesus went to his Death. This borne in mind we pass on to observe a marked divergence of practice in regard to the observance of the Paschal Feast. To state the position in fewest words; it was customary with the Christians of Asia Minor to celebrate it on the same day as the Jews, i.e., on the 14th of Nisan; not so in Western Christendom, where it was celebrated on the Sunday after.

Herein the point of difference between Polycarp and Anicetus when they met at Rome. It was urged by the former that he and his people were but steadfast in their adherence to the manner followed in Asia along with John the disciple of the Lord; the latter, on the other hand, appealed to the tradition of the Roman Church. They appear to have agreed to differ; and in token that there was no breach of fellowship, Polycarp was allowed by Anicetus to conduct the Eucharist. For a while controversy was hushed, but it again broke out; to rage fiercely at a subsequent day when, with the result of protest and remonstrance, the extreme step of breaking off Church fellowship was taken by the Roman Bishop Victor[1].

The question is, what exactly was it that the Christians of Asia Minor had in mind in their observance of the 14th of Nisan? In other words, what was the *rationale* of Quartodecimanism?

There is divergence of opinion. Minor differences apart, the views entertained by scholars admit of classification under three main heads, and we will enumerate them with necessary condensation[2]. To begin with, we are told that the 14th of Nisan was

[1] See Euseb. *HE*, v, 24, for the letter of Polycrates to Victor and the remonstrances addressed to the latter by Bishops of whom Irenaeus was one.

[2] Dr Stanton's exhaustive survey of the whole question (*Gospels as Hist. Documents*, i, pp. 173 ff.) is here laid under contribution. See also Drummond, *op. cit.* pp. 444 ff.; Zahn, *Einl.* ii, pp. 509 ff.; Schenkel, *op. cit.* pp. 253 ff.; Réville, *op. cit.* pp. 65 ff.; Calmes, *op. cit.* p. 66.

observed in commemoration of the Passover eaten by Jesus and his disciples on the night before the Crucifixion. According to a second view, the observance, directly founded upon the recognition that Jesus was himself the true Paschal Lamb, was a commemoration of the Death, on the 14th of Nisan, of Jesus. In the third place, it is maintained that, with no specific reference to either the Last Supper or the Death, the observance of the 14th of Nisan pointed rather to a Commemoration of the Divine Redemption typified in the ancient Passover and now accomplished in Christ, in which the thought of the Last Supper and of the Death on the Cross and the Resurrection were all included.

Let us pass on to inquire into the situation as it points from the foregoing explanation to our Gospel.

Polycarp, as we have observed, appealed ultimately to 'John.' Had the commemoration for which he pleaded been really that of a Passover eaten by Jesus and his disciples on the night before the Crucifixion, he could scarcely have looked for support to the author ot our Gospel; it would have been strange indeed had the latter been aider and abettor of a practice which was violently opposed to the sequence of his own narrative of the course of events. The case is altogether different with the two remaining explanations; the one being in full keeping with the Johannine representation, while of the other it may be said at the very least that there is no inherent incompatibility between Quartodeciman practice of such a nature and the Fourth Gospel Chronology. The question then is which of the three is entitled to the preference? The second is, of course, tempting, and it has been widely accepted; yet it breaks down with nearer scrutiny; for, in the first place, there is proof that contentions were actually based on the example assumed to have been set by Jesus in that he kept the Passover with his disciples; and next: if the 14th of Nisan observance had sole reference to his Death, how came it that no other day was set apart for commemorating the Resurrection? On the face of it the evidence might appear to be entirely on the side of the first;—and were such really the case it might then perhaps be argued that our Gospel is traceable to some late writer who does battle with the Christendom of Asia Minor and its Judaising Paschal solem-

nities[1]. But the evidence is not so strong as it seems; and there are weighty grounds for the conclusion that Quartodeciman practice had no exclusive reference to any one particular occurrence in the story of the Passion. The balance perhaps, weighs down in favour of the third explanation. An ancient festival is retained. Yet wider significance is attached to it; it breathes a new spirit[2].

It is not incumbent on us to follow the history of Quartodecimanism through its later stages, nor need we take account now of the Easter decisions arrived at A.D. 325 at the Council of Nicaea. We have noted that appeal was made by Polycarp to 'John'; the question arises whether our Gospel itself was definitely and distinctly brought into consideration. And here we turn to Apollinaris; to whom language as follows is attributed[3]: 'and they say, that on the 14th the Lord ate the Lamb with the disciples, and Himself suffered on the great day of unleavened bread, and they argue that Matthew so speaks as they have supposed; wherefore their position is out of harmony with the Law, and the Gospels according to them appear to be at variance.' The assumption surely is that, if Apollinaris did so really express himself, he at all events had our Gospel in his mind. And further: that if such were really the case, he was able to reconcile the discrepancy to his own satisfaction. Others, it would appear, did likewise.

Thus much of the perplexing question. It has, no doubt, a special interest of its own; whether it really throws any light on the date of our Gospel is open to doubt, and, as a matter of fact, there is a tendency to exclude it from consideration. We might indeed hesitate to decide whether 'the history of the Quartodeciman controversy affords valuable evidence of the early and wide reception of the Fourth Gospel[4],' or whether that history rather suggests an attitude unfavourable to its Apostolic authority in the very regions where that Gospel saw the light of day[5]. In either

[1] According to Schwegler (*op. cit.* p. 201), Apollinaris was the first teacher in Asia Minor to head a reaction against such an observance. Yet the position of Apollinaris himself is not altogether certain.

[2] The view of which Stanton says that 'it seems to be proved.'

[3] *Paschal Chronicle*, cited by Stanton, *op. cit.* pp. 180 f.

[4] Stanton, *op. cit.* p. 197.

[5] Réville, *op. cit.* p. 67.

case we fail to discover reason for modifying the conclusion already ventured that the date of our Gospel lies within the period *ca.* A.D. 100 (? 90)—125[1].

In the next chapter we shall examine into the literary structure of our Gospel and seek to decide the question whether it be a unity or a composite work.

[1] With allusion to 'die geschichtliche Situation in der sich die johanneischen Christen befinden,' Wetter (*op. cit.* p. 169) writes: 'Es ist die Zeit, da die Christen im Kampfe mit der populären hellenistischen Frömmigkeit standen. Dagegen finden wir nichts, das dafür zeugen könnte, dass sie im Kampf mit dem offiziellen Kultus des Staates, z. B. dem Kaiserkultus, standen.' It must suffice to say of the second point thus raised (in a quite recent book only just received) that there is nothing in our Gospel which, decisive for the state of affairs, might go near to fix a date.

CHAPTER VII

LITERARY STRUCTURE

As students are aware, 'the books of the Old Testament, as we now have them, are, to a far larger extent than was commonly supposed until recent times, the result of processes of compilation and combination, and, in modern phrase, "editing."' While the old view was that they were 'written as integral works or by a single author, and preserved precisely in the original form,' it is now generally recognized that 'some were constructed out of earlier narratives; some were formed by the union of previous collections of poetry or prophecies; some bear marks of the reviser's hand; and even books which bear the names of well-known authors in some cases contain matter which must be attributed to other writers[1].' Take, for instance, the Book of Zechariah; of its fourteen chapters only the first eight are traceable to the prophet himself, while the remaining six are of uncertain authorship and date. And again, there is clear proof of Judaean interpolation and revision in the case of the Book of Hosea; as for the Book of Amos, it is not unlikely that its last eight verses are a post-exilic substitute for an original ending which, felt to be too harsh, was deliberately suppressed; the short but incisive prophecy which goes by the name of 'Malachi' is of unknown authorship; 'The Vision of Obadiah' is in reality a mosaic of prophecies. Isaiah and Jeremiah are composite works, and so are the Books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles. The Psalter came into existence by successive stages; it may indeed contain some psalms of Davidic authorship, otherwise it reflects the varied aspirations of many periods and of many minds. The Pentateuch reaches back in part to a remote antiquity; yet, built up from four independent written sources, it was not until somewhere in the fifth century before the Christian era that, through processes of combination and redaction, it assumed its

[1] Kirkpatrick, *Divine Library of O.T.* pp. 11 ff.

present form[1]. And similarly with not a few of the writings of the New Testament. The author of the Lucan Gospel expressly refers[2] to sources laid under contribution by him; very probably the companion-volume Acts embodies, with a variety of other matter, the diary of a fellow-traveller of Paul. Large indeed are the borrowings of the author, compiler, or editor of 'The Revelation of St. John the Divine.' The Pastoral Epistles are perhaps made up of genuine Pauline sayings which have been pieced together and largely supplemented by a later hand. In like manner the unknown author of the so-called Second Epistle of Peter may possibly have brought together fragments which, if not actually Petrine, are quite conceivably of Apostolic origin, and provided them with a setting of his own composition[3]. The Epistle which bears the name of James has been held to be a Jewish work adapted by some editor for Christian use, or made up of passages from sermons of a relatively late date[4].

The question now before us is: How does the case stand with our Gospel? Is it a unity, the integral work of a single author? Or does it present features which stamp it as a composite work?

The former alternative is staunchly upheld. The 'unity and symmetry[5]' of the Gospel, its 'deep-seated unity of structure and composition[6],' are insisted on; it is affirmed that, the work of 'a single casting,' it 'stubbornly resists all modern attempts to distinguish between source and source[7].' Well-nigh half a century ago it was maintained that its twenty-one chapters emanate from the self-same author[8], and the like decided opinion was advanced but the other day: 'if we except the episode of the woman taken in adultery, which is of doubtful authority, the whole book is of uniform character and is the literary creation of a single author, including the last chapter, which is of the nature of a supplement[9].'

[1] Some of the foregoing sentences are borrowed from my *Eschatology of Jesus* (pp. 113 ff.).

[2] Lk. i, 1–4.

[3] E. Iliff Robson, *Studies in 2nd Peter.*

[4] See Bennett, *General Epistles* (*Century Bible*), p. 23.

[5] McClymont, *St John* (*Century Bible*), p. 29.

[6] Sanday, *op. cit.* p. 22.

[7] Barth, *op. cit.* p. 13.

[8] Lightfoot, *Bibl. Essays*, p. 194.

[9] Percy Gardner, *op. cit.* p. 53. Cf. Swete, *Studies in the Teaching of Our Lord*, p. 127.

But if there be general agreement that ch. xxi is an appendix to a work which has reached a perfectly natural conclusion with xx, 30, 31, the fact remains that of those who contend for the literary unity of the Gospel some unhesitatingly include the appendix chapter and some do not. In some quarters it is urged that ch. xxi is a 'supplement, not by the author of i–xx, but supplied by others, in the author's lifetime, with his approval, in fact, by his order[1]'; 'a later addition, and not only so but, as can be proved, by another hand[2].' Others, again, of one mind with two writers already instanced[3], are persuaded that 'in respect of style and manner this supplement reveals with exactness and nicety the self-same author who has penned the rest of the Gospel[4].' Somewhat differently another scholar; who, deciding that 'the complete identity of thought and style, and the way in which this last chapter is dovetailed into the preceding...seem to prove that the last chapter is by the same hand as the rest of the Gospel,' adds: 'But at the very end another hand does take up the pen; and this time the writer speaks in the name of a plurality; "this is that disciple which beareth witness of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his witness is true" (xxi, 24)[5].'

There are, then, not a few who, speaking generally, 'concur in the judgement of Strauss that the Fourth Gospel is, like the seamless coat, not to be divided but taken as it is[6],' if for some the phrase 'the whole indivisible Gospel[7]' means the Gospel in its entirety, while others draw the line at the appendix chapter.

Yet adverse voices are raised; and the view obtains in many quarters that, far from being a literary unity, 'the Fourth Gospel is a composite work[8].' Some fifteen years ago the suggestion was

[1] Zahn, *Einl.* ii, p. 493; Horn, *Abfassungszeit*, p. 77; Hausleiter (*Zwei Apos. Zeugen*) assigns ch. xxi to the Apostles Andrew and Philip.

[2] Soltau, *Unsere Evangelien*, p. 10; Schmiedel, *Evglm. Briefe u. Offenbarung*, pp. 12 f.; Schwartz, *Über den Tod der Söhne Zeb.* p. 48 Loisy (*op. cit.* p. 55), eliminating vii, 53–viii, 11 and xxi, writes: 'Tout le reste constitue un ensemble parfaitement un et homogène.' And see Réville, *op. cit.* p. 331.

[3] I.e. Percy Gardner and Lightfoot.

[4] Wernle, *op. cit.* p. 14.

[5] Sanday, *op. cit.* p. 81. Cf. Barth, *op. cit.* p. 6.

[6] *EB*, ii, col. 2558.

[7] Strauss, *New Life of Jesus*, i, p. 141.

[8] *EB*, iii, col. 3338.

thrown out that even if 'the famous comparison of Baur' holds good, 'the seamless coat had also a warp and woof and a tasselled fringe[1],' and to-day the same writer lays stress on an extensive series of phenomena which prove 'to the satisfaction of an increasing number of critics that the Fourth Gospel is anything but the "seamless coat" it was declared to be by the criticism of a generation ago[2]'; elsewhere he has said: 'Besides its "parenthetic additions"and passages relating to the "afterthought," the Fourth Gospel is notoriously full of the gaps and seams, the logical discrepancies and inconsistencies which, if not due to an extraordinary degree of carelessness on the part of the Evangelist, can only be explained as we explain them in other writings of the time. They must be due to later intervention, whether by combination with parallel documents, or by editorial revision, supplementation, or readjustment[3].' As may be inferred from this last sentence, those who disallow the unity of the Gospel are divided into two groups; the 'partitionists' and the 'revisionists.' With the various 'partition-theories' propounded by the former a distinction is drawn between an older source or sources in their combination with later editorial additions[4]. As for the latter[5], advancing their 'revision-theories' they argue each in his own way for some later editor who has 'recast the Gospel for purposes which originally it was not meant to serve. Either set of theories,' it is added, 'may be combined with the further hypothesis of dislocations in the text[6].'

Whether the Gospel be a unity or not[7], it appears on the face

[1] Bacon, *Introd. to N.T.* p. 268. 'The famous comparison,' by the way, not of Baur but Strauss (*Ulrich von Hutten, Gesammelte Schriften*, vii. p. 556). In citing from himself (*Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, p. 480) Prof. Bacon has since made the necessary correction.

[2] *HJ*, xv, p. 257. And see Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 551.

[3] Bacon, *Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, p. 473.

[4] So generally Wendt, Spitta, Wellhausen, with enhanced elaboration Soltau, *Das vierte Evglm. in seiner Entstehungsgeschichte dargelegt.* This work, published a year ago, reaches me at the last moment. Soltau's theory is criticized by Wetter, whose work ('*Der Sohn Gottes*') comes to me at the same time.

[5] Kreyenbühl, Harnack, Bousset, Heitmüller, Schwartz, Bacon.

[6] Moffatt, *op. cit.* pp. 551 f.

[7] The hypothesis of dislocations in the text is not necessarily incompatible with the theory that, speaking generally, the Gospel otherwise is a unity.

of it that, in respect of order of sequence, it has undergone a certain amount of structural disturbance and disarrangement[1]. To begin with, it surely cannot be the case[2] that the prolonged discourse, chs. xv, xvi, together with the 'High-priestly Prayer,' ch. xvii, originally stood immediately after the 'I will no more speak much with you' and the 'Arise let us go hence' of ch. xiv, 30, 31; and it shall be agreed at once that the words just cited 'are natural at the end of a discourse, and are naturally followed by xviii, 1, *ταῦτα εἰπὼν Ἰησοῦς ἐξῆλθεν κ.τ.λ.*[3]' And again; with the elimination of the *pericope de adultera* (vii, 53–viii, 11), it becomes obvious that there is a want of connexion[4] between the sections (vii, 52 ff., viii, 12 ff.) which immediately precede and follow what is, and will presently be recognized as, an interpolation[5]. Other instances could be adduced; yet general adhesion to the hypothesis of dislocations must be qualified by a suspicion that an element of subjectivity may now and again be at the root of suggested re-arrangements[6], and the cautious student will in any case be on his guard against a tendency to approach works of antiquity from a modern point of view. Nor will it do to 'assume a logical or chronological sequence in the Gospel which may not have been present to the author's mind[7].'

The admission appears inevitable that instances of interpolation, gap, and addition are perceptible. To revert in this connexion to the *pericope de adultera*; if here and there defended as an integral

[1] Forbes (*op. cit.* p. 163) finds reason to believe that Tatian had before him an edition of our Gospel in which the order was not the same as at present.

[2] In spite of arguments to the contrary. See Zahn, *Das Evglm. des Joh. unter den Händen seiner neuesten Kritiker*, pp. 6 ff.; Juncker, *Zur neuesten Johannes Kritik*, pp. 14 ff.

[3] Brooke, *CBE*, p. 323. Cf. Wellhausen, *Erweiterungen u. Änderungen im 4 Evglm.* pp. 7 f.; Moffatt, *op. cit.* pp. 556 f.

[4] Calmes (*op. cit.* p. 39) is of the opposite opinion.

[5] The *pericope* in question is for Warburton Lewis (*Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel*, p. 16) 'a standing proof that the text of our Gospel has suffered disruption.'

[6] The present writer, warmly commending Mr Warburton Lewis's scholarly little book to the careful perusal of students, is sometimes left unconvinced by its contents.

[7] Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 552. And see Wetter, *op cit.*, p. 2.

portion of the Fourth Gospel[1], it is regarded by the majority of scholars as an insertion of Synoptic rather than Johannine type; and conjecture has it that 'this floating passage of primitive tradition[2]...drifted as a marginal note into some MSS. of John... and finally was settled in the text[3]'; possibly it had its place in the Gospel of the Hebrews[4]. As certainly the verses ch. v, 3 *b*, 4, are no part of the original Gospel, and here it is suggested that an evident gap has been filled in, by way of explanation, by some later hand; that, as the section originally stood, the genuine v, 7 was unintelligible, and hence the piece of information which, now properly relegated to the margin of the R.V., ultimately found its way into the text[5]. On these and other points there is a consensus of opinion; highly debatable ground is reached when seam or rent is discovered in such passages as e.g., vi, 36 ff., xviii, 12 ff., xix, 34 ff.[6], and it is argued that the sections in the Prologue which refer to the Baptist are the insertions of another hand[7]. Room, again, is made for the opinion that, inasmuch as the full significance of xii, 32 goes far beyond the somewhat meagre explanation offered in xii, 33, the latter verse reveals another pen-man. It is further said that the references to Caiaphas (xi, 49; xviii, 1–21) were absent from the Gospel in its original form[8]; yet further, that it is not inconceivable that the sections in which the Beloved Disciple figures on the scene owe not a little of their colouring to an editorial

[1] 'Aber in dem Zusammenhang ist sie (viz. the *pericope*) unentbehrlich'; Hilgenfeld, *Einl.* p. 707. And see *Catholic Encycl.* Art. 'St John's Gospel.'

[2] 'Wir sind dem Zufall dankbar, das er diese verlorene Perle alter Überlieferung uns erhalten hat,' Heitmüller, *SNT*, ii, p. 789.

[3] Moffatt, *op. cit.* pp. 555 f.

[4] Euseb. *HE*, iii, 39. But the story there referred to of a woman accused of many sins may point to Lk. vii, 37 ff. and not to Jn vii, 53 ff.

[5] Bacon, *Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, pp. 474 f.

[6] Heitmüller, *SNT*, ii, pp. 701, 716.

[7] 'Zwischen i, 4 und i, 9 steht in der Tat Johannes störend,' Wellhausen, *Das Evglm. Joh.* p. 8. And see Bacon, *op. cit.* p. 478. With allusion to the 'extraordinary verse,' iii, 11, Percy Gardner (*op. cit.* p. 121 f.) writes: 'it has evidently slipped into the discourse to Nicodemus by mistake.'

[8] 'Kaiphas ist also überall eingetragen. Die Vorlage kennt ihn nicht, sondern bloss den Annas,' Wellhausen, *Das Evglm. Joh.* p. 81. And see the same author's *Erweiterungen u. Änderungen*, pp. 24 ff.

hand[1]. Yet here again it must be borne in mind that what to modern eyes may appear insertion, rent, or seam, or gap[2], is perhaps often attributable to the idiosyncrasy of the Evangelist, and that a probability remains that, albeit it may be necessary to postulate an editor or redactor, the former may be after all himself responsible for this or that apparent interpolation.

Other features are presented by our Gospel which unquestionably occasion pause. In one place, at any rate so it would appear to some, the Parousia is dispensed with (xiv), while elsewhere (xv–xvii) it dominates the conception; in one place (xiv. 16, 26) the Paraclete is to be sent by the Father, in another (xv. 26; xvi, 7) the sender will be Jesus himself. Nor is it only a case of what, in the view at all events of some scholars, is discrepancy and contradiction; the long discourse-sections, in many respects quite unlike those made up of narrative[3], are held to reveal different hands. Be this the case or not, they are occasionally of such a nature as to convey the idea of essays which owe their existence to processes of elaboration, and with large resort to matter already the common property of the church or churches of the locality in which the Gospel originated[4].

But to bring this chapter to a close.

The Fourth Gospel, it would appear, is not, in the strictest sense of the word, the unity which it has been, and still is, held to

[1] On the assumption that a real person, the Beloved Disciple was author of the Gospel it is certainly easier to suppose that the beautiful designation was from a pen other than his own. See *Excursus* ii. See also Heitmüller, *SNT*, ii, p. 711.

[2] It shall be said here that the present writer, not by any means in entire agreement with Juncker (*op. cit.*), is far from being convinced by Schwartz (*Aporien im vierten Evglm.*). As Brooke shrewdly remarks (*CBE*, p. 325): 'We are driven to the suspicion that to have supplied all the *paralipomena* which such a method of criticism would demand might have involved a number of books which the world itself could not contain, nor its inhabitants live long enough to read.'

[3] Preferred by, e.g., Renan to the discourse-matter, while the opposite view is maintained by, *int. al.*, Weisse, A. Schweitzer, Wendt.

[4] On Wetter's theory there is evidence 'dass wir es mit formelhaften Gut zu tun haben, das nicht vom Verfasser geprägt sondern einfach von ihm übernommen worden ist'; with a religious phraseology which, long time in pagan use, is turned to account by Hellenistic Christians (*op. cit.* pp. 2, 156).

be; it is, to say the least, not easy to regard it as throughout the integral work of a single author.

There is ground for looking askance at the theories of the 'partitionists.' Not without reason has it been objected that, when the Gospel has been divided up between assumed 'Grundschrift' and material assigned to other hands, the respective groups of matter wear so strong a family resemblance that it is often practically impossible to distinguish between pen and pen. Yet it is only just to say of representatives of this school of criticism that they have rendered useful service[1] in so far as they emphasize the fact that 'undoubtedly there are two elements in the Fourth Gospel: the words and deeds of the Lord, and the interpretation of them in the light of later experience'; and that, whatever be its nature as a whole, there are embedded in it 'fragments of historical value for the story of the Ministry of Jesus Christ[2].'

Looking to the position generally, it would appear that greater weight attaches to the arguments brought forward by the 'revisionists'; and that the balance of probability is in favour of a theory which, avoiding exaggerations and extremes, nevertheless distinguishes between the main fabric of the Gospel and final touches—not to say amplifications—received by it before it was given to the world.

Of such sort shall be our working hypothesis in the next chapter.

[1] The names of Spitta and Wendt may be mentioned in this connexion.
[2] Brooke, *CBE*, pp. 327 f.

CHAPTER VIII

THE MAKING OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

The stage is now reached when, with no pretence of speaking last words on the complicated subject of our inquiry and profoundly conscious of problems still unsolved and perhaps insoluble, we may at least venture tentative conclusions on the three-fold question of the authorship of the main fabric of our Gospel, the methods employed in its composition, and the processes whereby it assumed its present form.

Let us begin by asking whether it be possible to determine the identity of him who, responsible for the main fabric of our Gospel, shall be styled the Fourth Evangelist.

It was once said that of all the views and opinions then current in the region of Biblical research the one which, continually gaining ground, was the more likely to win its way speedily to general acceptance was that which deliberately and decisively set aside the traditional authorship of 'the Gospel according to St. John[1].' Many years have elapsed since those words were uttered; and, were the speaker of them alive to-day, he would be forced to admit that he had been far too confident with his predictions inasmuch as staunch upholders of the traditional belief are still present in our midst. Nor are they solely discoverable in the many pious and devout souls who, as we have observed already[2], are either unaware of, or prefer to shut their eyes and ears to, the grave difficulties which the Gospel presents. On the contrary, there are men in repute for scholarship who, having approached and grappled with the Johannine problem, are content to acquiesce in the traditional belief that 'John's' Gospel is the genuine work of the Apostle John.

Yet it would appear that they are no longer in the majority; and while the day has not come for anything like a consensus of

[1] So, in effect, A. R. Loman, *op. cit.* p. 7. [2] See ch. 1.

opinion, it is certain that the view which discards the traditional authorship of our Gospel is rapidly gaining ground. Such a view is put forth boldly and uncompromisingly by scholars in the front rank both at home and abroad. If hesitation there sometimes be, it is but momentary: thus when it is said of the Fourth Gospel that its authorship by John son of Zebedee, while possible, is improbable in the extreme[1].

We can but yield assent. On the one hand we will leave room for an exceedingly bare possibility that our Gospel comes to us from the Apostle John; on the other hand we are constrained to feel that the chances of his authorship being proved to satisfaction are exceedingly remote, and that the expression 'improbable in the extreme' may justifiably be adopted by ourselves. The external evidence is, at best, inconclusive; while there can be little question that features are presented by the Gospel itself which, not absolutely incompatible with the hypothesis of an eye-witness, are nevertheless of such a nature as to suggest that, whatever the identity of the Evangelist, he not only wears small resemblance to the son of Zebedee, but must be sought for outside the number of the traditional Twelve. Yet further; the Gospel, beyond all reasonable doubt, originated in Asia Minor[2], and a stream of tradition must be reckoned with which goes near to prove that John the Apostle lived his life and died a martyr's death in Palestine[3]. If it really be the case that those who speak at the close of the appendix chapter were fully persuaded in their own minds—and this is doubtful—that he to whom they allude (Jn xxi, 24) was verily and indeed the son of Zebedee, the probability is that such belief is ultimately traceable to a confusion between two distinct personages of whom one was the Apostle while the other was vaguely designated a disciple of the Lord.

The Fourth Evangelist is, in all probability, not the Apostle John;—who, then, is he? Conjectures are numerous; let some be instanced before we ourselves venture any tentative conclusions.

[1] Forbes, *op. cit.* p. 170.

[2] Conjecture has pointed to Egypt. Jülicher (*op. cit.* p. 387) transfers the place of origination to Syria, not excluding Palestine. With allusion to our Gospel Calmes (*op. cit.* p. 60) rightly decides thus: 'il est donc impossible de lui assigner un lieu d'origine autre que l'Asie mineure.' [3] See *Excursus* i.

To begin with. There are very remarkable coincidences both of thought and diction between our Gospel and the treatise which, known as 'the Epistle to the Ephesians,' may have been composed by some Paulinist disciple who, after the manner of the age, put forth his work under the name of the revered founder of the Ephesian Church. It is, then, an exceedingly tempting hypothesis that, with an interval between them, the two great writings emanated from the self-same pen[1]. If, however, such were really the case—and there are weighty arguments against it[2]—the identity of the author of the two works would remain an open question.

Again. Attention has been called in like manner to remarkable coincidences between our Gospel and the Epistle to the Hebrews; and it is urged that the only satisfactory explanation is one which assigns both writings to a single author who, combining in himself a rich variety of scholarly qualifications, must have been a convert from Judaism, versed in Alexandrian learning, in touch with Baptist-disciples, and subsequently with the Apostle John. The contention then is that, for the portrait of one who was evidently no insignificant or unknown personage, we have but to turn to Acts xix, 24–28; the Apollos who there stands full in view is not only author of the said Epistle but the Fourth Evangelist[3].

To pass from this certainly interesting hypothesis as it was advanced by the sometime Pastor of Uitikon in Zürich[4] to the far less plausible conjecture which, identifying the Beloved Disciple with the Apostle Andrew, transfers the origination of the Gospel from Ephesus to regions bordering on Parthia where Andrew and Thomas had laboured and were in high renown. By preference it fixes on Edessa or its vicinity as the place where our Gospel was composed. The Fourth Evangelist is no Jew nor yet a Greek; he

[1] W. Lock (*DB*, i, p. 717) regards it as 'a tenable view that the writer (sc. of 'Ephesians') was the author of the Fourth Gospel, writing in the name of St. Paul.'

[2] There being much to be said in favour of the genuineness of the Epistle: and if it be presumed, the date of Paul's death would of itself suffice to rule him out as author of so late a work as our Gospel.

[3] Tobler, *Die Evangelienfrage*, *passim*; *ZWT*, 1860, p. 293; Heft ii, pp. 177 ff. By the perplexing ἐκεῖνος of Jn xix, 35, says Tobler (p. 201), Apollos means the apostle John.

[4] Sc. Tobler.

is perhaps a Syrian, who, by birth a Samaritan, had fled, when a mere boy, with his parents beyond the Euphrates at the outset of the Jewish war. At Edessa he became a Christian; and later on, perchance, a Bishop. He could quite well have known Andrew the Beloved Disciple. Himself author of the main fabric of the Gospel, it was reserved for another hand to supplement it—on this side of the Euphrates, in Asia Minor—with the appendix chapter[1].

According to another, and more recent, hypothesis[2], the one solitary indisputable statement, which, in view of the internal evidence, can be advanced by criticism with regard to John's Gospel must to-day run thus: 'the author is the Beloved Disciple, but the Beloved Disciple is not the Apostle, nor yet a disciple of the Apostle, nor yet John the Presbyter, nor yet the High priest John, nor yet the author of the Johannine Epistles.' Who, then, is this Beloved Disciple? The question is answered with the following equation: The Beloved Disciple = Lazarus = the sick boy of Jn iv, 46 = the impotent man of Jn v, 5 = the man blind from his birth of Jn ix, 11 = the author of our Gospel. The final equation identifies him with the Gnostic Menander.

Less far-fetched is the hypothesis[3] which discovers the Beloved Disciple in the Aristion alluded to by Papias; and, insisting that the true reading should be Ariston, locates the bearer of what is held to be almost certainly an honourable nick-name (ἄριστος) in the neighbourhood of Ephesus and perhaps at Smyrna. As for the Fourth Evangelist, he is 'John whose surname was Mark'; and it is he, not John the Apostle, whose closing years are spent at Ephesus. With the lapse of time he has become ever more and more dissatisfied with his earlier work, our second Gospel; in the event he embarks on the composition of a 'spiritual' Gospel which sets forth his deepened and matured reflexions and convictions on the Person and the Ministry of Jesus. Himself destitute of claims

[1] So Lützelberger, *op. cit.* pp. 199 ff.

[2] Kreyenbühl, *op. cit.* pp. 627, 632, 642, 644, 810. When Kreyenbühl speaks of 'der einzige unangreifbare Satz,' he is making play with the opinion advanced (*op. cit.* pp. 374 f.) by Jülicher.

[3] Condensed from some notes by E. Iliff Robson which he is now preparing for the press.

to the authority of an eye-witness—except, perhaps, in respect of the closing scenes; in any case but a mere youth at the date of the Crucifixion—he turns for information to the friend and near neighbour who can tell him of the things which were said and done by One who for both of them was Lord and Master. With his ἐκεῖνος of Jn xix, 35, he points to Ariston, viz. the Beloved Disciple. If more generally known as Marcus, it was at an earlier period—the Roman name being then best suited to the circumstances; the time came when his Jewish name Johannan was reverted to, and hence the great treatise which occupied the closing years of his life is designated 'John's' Gospel.

The conjecture, not altogether novel[1], is at best interesting. It makes much of coincidences between the Second and the Fourth Gospels[2]; it goes on to urge that, while there is ground for the belief that John, son of Zebedee, devoting all his remaining energies to 'the circumcision,' never stepped outside Palestine, the John Mark known to us from New Testament allusions had not only been a great traveller but had come under the influence of the great Apostle to the Gentiles, and, as tradition has it, became Bishop of Alexandria[3]. Yet, apart from questions raised by the suggested emendation, it takes too much for granted; inasmuch as the Beloved Disciple of the Fourth Gospel representation, not standing full in view until the closing scenes, might not himself have had first-hand knowledge of what took place during the earlier stages of the Ministry. And again, when the point is raised that, in antiquity, the name of John Mark was actually connected with the Johannine literature, it must be remembered that it was only in respect of the Apocalypse[4]; and it would be difficult, not to say impossible, to identify the author, or compiler, of this latter work

[1] It is within my recollection that some dozen or more years ago it was said to me by a friend: 'The Fourth Gospel spells John Mark.' But where and how does it spell it?

[2] See E. A. Abbott, *Joh. Grammar.*

[3] *Praefatio vel argumentum Marci.* See Wordsworth's and White's *NT Lat.* i, p. 171. But the tradition is scarcely in favour of the hypothesis.

[4] See Dionysius (Euseb. *HE*, vii, 25) on the authorship of the Apocalypse. That work has been definitely assigned to John Mark by Hitzig (*Joh. Marcus und seine Schriften*), and Spitta (*Offenbarung des Johannes*) regards him as author of one of the sources of that work—an 'Urapocalypse.'

—John Mark or not—with him from whose pen there came the Fourth Gospel[1].

Of such hypotheses and conjectures as the foregoing it may at least be said that, whatever be their claims to serious consideration, they are so many illustrations of a growing tendency to discard the traditional authorship of our Gospel; and, by consequence, to cast about in divers quarters for the type of person to whom its composition may be assigned.

Whoever he was, the Evangelist[2] was assuredly a Jew. By birth and early training he was, in all likelihood, a Jew of Palestine who, at some period or other, had quitted his Palestinian home, and after much travelling, had found himself on the soil of Asia Minor; in the event he settled down at Ephesus. It may or may not have been the case that he was already full of years when he began to pen his Gospel. Beyond all question he was a man of soul and brain, of a contemplative turn of mind[3], in touch with Greek philosophy[4] and versed in Alexandrine speculation[5], a philosopher and a theologian. He may indeed convey the impression that he had actually been eye- and ear-witness of at all events some of the events and scenes told of by him in the pages of his work. Yet the temptation is now and again strong to say of it that the evidences of dependence are so many and so convincing 'as to justify or even compel the inference that the author is not an eye-witness supplementing the Synoptic account by his own minute remembrances[6]... but a writer somewhat remote from the events[7]' which he purports to relate.

[1] Few would agree with Lange (*op. cit.* p. 11) that only the author of the Fourth Gospel could write the Apocalypse and *vice versa*, or say with H. H. Evans (*op. cit.* p. 78), 'it is therefore a psychological impossibility that the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel should have been other than the work of one and the same mind.'

[2] That is, the author of the main fabric, or bulk, of our Gospel.

[3] Whose 'little book,' as Herder (*op. cit.* p. 349) puts it, 'ist ein tiefer, stiller See.' But is this quite true of it?

[4] Cf. Cohu, *op. cit.* p. 429. [5] Cf. Calmes, *op. cit.* p. 60.

[6] So that his work becomes, in the often quoted words of Herder (*op. cit.* p. 424), 'der älteren Evangelien Nachhall im höheren Tone.'

[7] Forbes, *op. cit.* pp. 154 f. Of our Gospel, De Wette (*op. cit.* ii, p. 211) says that it 'eher als einen Augenzeugen einen Schriftsteller zu verrathen

Let us take refuge—and not for the first time—in an 'either—or.' It may be that the Fourth Evangelist is really that Beloved Disciple[1] to whom, no doubt with variety of identification, some so confidently point, and from whom others as resolutely turn away. Or he may be some other person; and one, who, possibly, had derived some store of information from the Beloved Disciple. To word what is after all but a tentative conclusion thus: the Beloved Disciple is perhaps author of, more likely authority for, the main fabric of the Fourth Gospel.

Whichever way it be, the identity of the Fourth Evangelist remains undisclosed. It is all very well to ask[2] whether, even had he so desired, he could have kept the fact of his authorship a secret, and in the very locality where the Gospel originated; and an apt rejoinder might instance the undisclosed secret of the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews[3]. With better show of reason is it suggested that, if he remained, and remains, the 'Great Unknown,' it is precisely because he himself did not wish to be known[4] except, as is quite probable, within the limited number of his more intimate friends and colleagues, of the faithful group for whom he was theologian, doctor, and prophet. The supposition that it was not his intention that his work should forthwith reach wider circles is perhaps well-founded[5].

It was said by Origen of the Epistle to the Hebrews that who its author was God only knew[6]; and the same words may be used of the work traditionally assigned to St John.

To pass on to our second question; it relates to methods adopted by the Evangelist in the composition of his Gospel.

Let it be freely granted that inspiration was with him both for the inception and the penning of his work. Truly might it be said

scheint, in dessen nicht ursprünglicher Anschauung der Geschichte die Zeiträume in einander schwemmen.'

[1] On the not absolutely safe assumption that he, in any case not John son of Zebedee, is a real person.

[2] With Gutjahr, *Glaubwürdigkeit*, pp. 183 ff.

[3] The latter work was perhaps less calculated to invite question than 'John's' Gospel.

[4] Réville, p. 319. 'Ich glaube,' writes Grill (*Untersuchungen*, p. vi), 'er wollte und wird unbekannt bleiben.'

[5] Loisy, *op. cit.* pp. 34 f.

[6] Euseb. *HE*, vi, 25.

of him that he 'made ready his soul, as some well-fashioned and jewelled lyre with strings of gold, and yielded it for the utterance of something great and sublime to the spirit[1]': let it then be added that inspiration did not mean in his case any more than in the case of other Bible writers that, becoming but a living pen in the grasp of an Almighty hand, he wrote *currente calamo* from divine dictation. On the contrary, he would make careful and systematic preparation; and a prolonged period must be allowed for during which he was busily engaged in the collection of material. He would consult his sources; and if the Synoptic Gospels were not actually before him as documents, he would draw as seemed good to him on his own memorized knowledge of their contents[2]. Living authorities would naturally be questioned by him; and here the thought might be, on the one hand, of survivors from the number of those who had themselves stood in the presence of Jesus, and, on the other hand, of men whose knowledge was derived from others whose claim to have been eye-witnesses was beyond dispute[3]. If himself really the Beloved Disciple he would muse over and jot down his own hallowed memories of far-off days when he had companied with the Master; while, on the assumption that he was a third person, he might listen to such stories as were told him by the 'Disciple whom Jesus loved'; and, whichever way it was, he would supplement them by his own reflexions on the Christ who lived in his heart. It may safely be inferred that large recourse was had by him to that oral instruction in which, no doubt, he himself participated as leader[4]; of the substance—quite probably the form[5]—of the teaching and preaching which went on

[1] Chrysostom, *Hom. on St John*, i. [2] A list of parallels is given by Loisy.

[3] Of the information thus gained some might point ultimately to, amongst others, the son of Zebedee; and, on that assumption he would (to borrow Harnack's words) stand in some way or other behind the Fourth Gospel. Soltau, in his seven-fold partition-theory (*op. cit.* p. 38), places first and second in order 'L(egende) nach mündlichen Berichten des Apostel Johannes; ergänzt nach S(ynoptische) durch S(ynoptische) Perikopen).' See also Strachan, *op. cit.* pp. ix f.

[4] A main source of our Gospel, writes Calmes (*op. cit.* p. 43), consisted 'dans cet enseignement oral qui, vers la fin du premier siècle, florissait en Asie Mineure, et dont'—so he adds—'l'apôtre Saint Jean fut l'âme.'

[5] The discourse-sections have the appearance of essays, or studied compositions, which had undergone polishing by frequent repetition and revision.

regularly in the Christian communities of the locality, and of that controversial discussion in which, whether with Gentile or with Jew, he would take an active share[1]. Time goes on, and large store of matter – in part, perhaps, digested and revised by him – is ready to his hand.

And so the day comes when a start is made with the actual composition of the work which, long time in contemplation, had for long time engaged our Evangelist in the preliminaries of collecting and sorting materials which point not only to a variety of written and oral sources, but to the product of his own mind and soul.

Again room must be allowed for a considerable interval between start and finish. It is in the last degree improbable that the Gospel was penned at a stroke; and it is far more likely that one or other section was in the first instance worked up as a separate unity, and that such sections were subsequently so pieced together as to form an organic whole[2]. Neither will it do to conceive of the Evangelist as seated, solitary, at his study table; with good reason may we believe that he freely availed himself of the assistance of his disciples and attached friends[3]. Quite possibly he now and again talked (or, as one might say, thought aloud), while they took down with pen and ink his spoken words. It would have been quite in accordance with the customs of the age if, for some portions of his Gospel, he employed the services of a professional amanuensis who wrote from his dictation[4].

The main fabric of our Gospel, it may accordingly be concluded,

[1] Thus, in effect, Dr Stanton, in his Exposition delivered 31 Jan. 1916, before the Senate of the University of Cambridge. Let me here express my gratitude to our Regius Professor, who has allowed me to refresh my recollection of the spoken word by a perusal of his MS.

[2] 'Vielleicht ist das Evglm. nicht in einem Zug entstanden; vielleicht wurden einzelne Stücke allein ausgearbeitet, und dann erst zum Ganzen vereinigt,' Heitmüller, *SNT*, ii, p. 701. More definitely, Loisy, *op. cit.* pp. 141, 145.

[3] 'Unter freier Beihülfe von Freunden,' writes H. Ewald (*op. cit.* i, p. 56). The legendary story embodied in the Muratorian fragment is strongly suggestive of collaboration.

[4] An interesting paper, entitled 'Composition and Dictation in N.T. Books,' by E. Iliff Robson (*JTS*, xviii, pp. 288 ff.), is very suggestive in this connexion.

was a gradual growth. That before a line of it was penned, the contents of it as a whole lay spread out before the author in his inmost soul[1], is a conjecture which will scarcely pass muster; yet it may be readily admitted, not to say asserted, that, reserving to himself full liberty for deviation and modification as the work progressed, he had sketched the rough outline and generally decided in regard to plan. From one point of view the word 'composite' may be used of it, inasmuch as a variety of sources had been utilized by him. It may nevertheless be spoken of as a unity, in that its matter was stamped with the impress of his own mind.

But the time had not yet come for it to be given to the world; and the further conclusion now ventured is that whatever circulation it reached was limited to that inner circle which consisted of the Evangelist's disciples and attached friends. In any case there is nothing to suggest that the main fabric of our Gospel was ever published by itself apart[2]. The evidences indeed, are of such a nature as to point the other way.

Turning to our third, and last, question, we now inquire as to the steps and processes whereby the Fourth Gospel assumed its present form.

Conjectures are numerous. The appendix chapter being omitted, it is said of our Gospel that we possess it for the most part in the form it originally wore; but that interpolations here and there are due to some later editor whose materialistic conceptions, Jewish-Christian modes of thought, and far less developed standpoint, can be detected in the explanations and elucidations of the supposed meaning of the Evangelist which he attempts[3]. It was proved to his own satisfaction by an earlier critic that, worked over not once but twice, and by two different hands, the Gospel points ultimately to an Alexandrian Gnostic—quite possibly the author of the Apoca-

[1] As suggested by Niermeyer, *Bijdragen ter Verdediging van de Echtheid der Joh. Schriften*, pp. 39 ff.

[2] Spitta's contention (*Das Johannes Evglm.*) points to the 'Grundschrift' of his partition-theory, and in no way bears on the 'main fabric' of our conjecture; which, again, is something quite different from the 'ältere Schicht...welche,' according to Wendt (*op. cit.* p. 111), 'berechtigten Anspruch darauf hat, für eine primäre, geschichtlichwertvolle Überlieferung zu gelten.'

[3] Scholten, *Het Evan. naar Joh.* p. 72.

lypse—who supplied the Prologue by way of substitute for a lost or damaged Introduction[1]; a few years later the contention was raised that in our Gospel there are traces unmistakable, not of interpolations only, but of independent redaction on the part of one who allowed himself a very free hand[2]. According to the original intention of the Evangelist, so runs a still later suggestion, his Gospel was to remain until his death the possession solely of his nearer friends; ten years elapsed, and then, his friends again collaborating but this time allowing themselves a freer hand, the appendix chapter was penned, its two closing verses being added by the friends in question[3]. With nice distinctions between genuine Johannine 'wonders' and miracle akin to magic, between Galilaean and Judaean sections, and with the remark that an impression conveyed by our Gospel is that two altogether diverse spirits are discernible in its contents, the hypothesis was advanced which, pausing for a moment on two distinct authors, went on to dwell on a work which reveals the additions and interpolations of a later redactor; one who, having appended the narratives contained xxi, 1–23, put forth the Gospel with an assurance which points back to xx, 30 f. and which declares (*vv.* 24 f.) the work of the eye-witness alluded to in the immediately preceding narrative to be worthy of respect and use[4]. More recently, and with detailed specification of three different interests which our Gospel is held to reflect, it is said to be possible yet not probable that such interests were present in one and the self-same person, and that hence the probability is that the structure of the Gospel has undergone changes[5].

Our Gospel has certainly undergone changes in that, at some time or other, it suffered disarrangement and dislocation. Tell-tale evidences are, in some cases, more or less clearly perceptible: yet

[1] Cludius, *op. cit.* p. 321. For his reconstruction of the Prologue, see pp. 58 ff.

[2] Ammon, *Joh. evangelii auctorem ab editore hujus libri fuisse diversum.*

[3] H. Ewald, *op. cit.* pp. 56 f. According to Ewald, the Gospel (i–xx) was composed *ca.* A.D. 80 by the Apostle.

[4] Alex. Schweizer, *op. cit.*; see in particular pp. vi, 6 ff., 23, 59 ff., 97 ff., 125, 164 ff., 233 ff.

[5] Forbes, *op. cit.* pp. 163 f. The three interests being as follows: attempted adjustment to the Synoptics, the grouping of material round the feasts at Jerusalem, Christological.

opinion is bound to differ as to their extent, and it has already been impressed upon us that what to modern eyes appears gap or lack of sequence may nevertheless have been in keeping—and was so regarded in antiquity—with the author's train of thought[1]. Neither is it possible to determine when such changes were effected or how precisely they came about.

The question must now be narrowed down to a distinction between the work of the Evangelist and that of a redactor (or redactors): and in dealing with it we will pick up the threads dropped by us in the closing sentences of the preceding chapter.

Two preliminary remarks. In the first place, we cannot but admit that it is more than doubtful whether attempts to distinguish not only between document and document but between hand and hand in our Gospel will ever be crowned with full and final success[2]. And secondly, we promptly acquiesce when told[3] that not every unevenness in the text or apparent or actual contradiction of itself justifies the search for documentary sources; and that —what is very much to the present purpose—ample allowance must be made for clumsiness on the part of the author; for a diversity of possible points of view, for manifoldness of personal and documentary influences, for fluctuating mood and view during the period in which the work originated, for the author's own corrections of his completed work, or for minor improvements by some later hand which left the original work essentially intact. Let us add that it would be just as impossible to reconstruct the conjectured original work of the Evangelist from our Fourth Gospel only, as to reconstruct the Marcan Gospel from the two later Synoptics.

[1] 'Quand il s'agit d'un livre comme le 4e Évangile,' says Calmes (*op. cit.* p. 38), 'il faut s'attacher avant tout à suivre la pensée de l'auteur.' The very thing which it is often hard to do.

[2] Calmes (*op. cit.* p. 43), with specific reference to Spitta and Wendt, writes: 'Mais il est plus que douteux que l'on arrive jamais à distinguer dans ce livre des documents divers.' He adds: 'Non qu'il soit un modèle d'unité—on y remarque des transitions brusques et des redites—mais c'est, d'un bout à l'autre, le même esprit et le même style. L'unité est relative, mais réelle.' Heitmüller (*N.T.* ii. p. 701) regards the 'Überarbeiter' as having been successful in producing what is, on the whole, a unity, a compacted work.

[3] The words which follow are adapted from Spitta (*op. cit.* p. 402).

Let us proceed on the lines of that 'revisionist' theory which we have already decided to adopt.

We at once mark off the section vii, 53–viii, 11[1]. The *pericope de adultera* is in any case a foreign element in our Gospel; while it presents points of contact with the Synoptic representation, there is no certainty with regard to its origination. And next, the legendary explanation of 'the troubling of the water,' v, 3 *b*–5, is a gloss[2], and likewise disappears from the Gospel. These two passages, however, point to the field of textual criticism, and do not come into question for our present purpose.

We now turn to the appendix chapter (xxi). So far as our knowledge goes, the Gospel was never circulated without it[3]; opinions differ as to whether it was added during the lifetime of the Evangelist, and, if so, whether by others or by himself. In respect of style and diction it wears, no doubt, striking resemblances to the main bulk of the Gospel[4]; yet the view appears preferable that it is an addition, and by a later hand, to a work which had reached a formal close with the preceding chapter, and the contingency must be reckoned with that its final verse is of separate origination. Looking to the type of subject-matter it might perhaps be said of the chapter[5] that it affords an instance of attempted adjustment to the Synoptic representation; but whether the intention really was to rehabilitate Peter, or, by conceding prominence to Peter, to stifle objections which had been raised at Rome, is quite another question.

The emphatic statement, xxi, 24, is strongly reminiscent of the equally emphatic statement met with xix, 35, and the probability is that both statements must be assigned to the same later pen. It is further possible that the like conclusion holds good, not of *v.* 35 only, but of *vv.* 31 *b* and 37 also[6].

To pass on to the sections in which the Beloved Disciple figures

[1] See RV margin. [2] See RV margin.

[3] As, *int. al.*, Niermeyer (*op. cit.* p. 26) rightly points out.

[4] 'Elle est d'autre provenance,' says Réville (*op. cit.* p. 305) with allusion to this chapter, but he adds (p. 307), 'par une main de même famille que celle de l'auteur.'

[5] Which, in the eyes of Cludius (*op. cit.* p. 67), was 'ein unbedeutendes falsches Anhängsel.' Spitta's results consequent on his examination of the appendix chapter (*op. cit.* pp. 16 f.) are certainly interesting.

[6] So Heitmüller (*SNT*, ii, p. 711) who (p. 701) regards it as conceivable

in the scene. No difficulty is raised by the fact that the designation is applied to this mysterious personage in the appendix chapter, for this chapter has already been assigned by us to a hand other than that of the Evangelist. It is however quite another matter when the designation is met with elsewhere in the Gospel; and the choice lies, it might be said, between two alternatives; either the Evangelist is not the Beloved Disciple—in which case he could quite well have used the designation of a third person: or the hand of a redactor is traceable in the respective sections. That it is so traceable is, in any case, probable; yet not so as to necessitate the conclusion that the entire sections were altogether absent from the original work. If the words 'whom Jesus loved' be therein attached to the 'disciple' alluded to, the phrase was perhaps imported by the redactor from the appendix chapter.

There is some show of ground for the belief that the sections which relate to Caiaphas are, to say the least, not free from interpolation, and on such an assumption the charge of having blundered (in holding the high-priesthood to be an annual office)[1] might cease to lie at the door of the Evangelist himself.

Turning to the discourse with Nicodemus (iii, 1 ff.), we cannot but agree that *v.* 11 reads awkwardly in the context; and the conclusion may be ventured that, suggestive of later circumstances and conditions, it is an importation from an unknown source.

Attention is next claimed by a group of passages which are either not exactly in harmony with other passages (e.g., ii. 19: iii. 29 and iii. 31; iii. 22. 26; iv, 1 and iv. 2)[2], or which are strongly suggestive of explanations which have missed the mark (e.g., xii, 32; xvii, 12 and xviii, 9); and the impression is hard to avoid that they reflect the workings of another and a duller mind[3]. The case is otherwise when (e.g., x. 5. 10) there is a mere change of metaphor.

that the pen which added ch. xxi was that of the author of the First Epistle. On Jn xxi. xix. 35 see Calmes. *op. cit.* pp. 40 f., 'ont une origine fort ancienne,' if by another hand.

[1] If such be really the conception which underlies Jn xi. 49. 51: xviii, 13.

[2] Cludius (*op. cit.* p. 37) unhesitatingly adds iii, 17: v. 22: xii. 47. And see Wendt, *Die Schichten im vierten Evglm.* p. 28.

[3] See in this connexion J. M. Thompson, *Proceedings of Soc. of Hist. Théol.* (Oxford) for the year 1916–17, pp. 49 ff.

Nor is there occasion of difficulty in respect of what appear to be doublets (e.g., vi, 39 f.; xiv, 13 f.; xvii, 14, 16); for, in the first place, such features are not peculiar to our Gospel, and secondly, it might suffice to speak of prolixity of expression.

Unquestionably there are sections which illustrate diversity of view and standpoint. Two of them have already been enumerated (xiv, cf. xv–xviii; xiv, 16, 26, cf. xv, 26; xvi, 7) while a third (v, 21 ff.) has just been noticed in a foot-note reference[1]; and the question then arises whether, apart from divergence of conception relative to the sending of the Paraclete, the self-same author who can apparently dispense with an external Parousia has nevertheless had resort to the turns and phrases of Jewish Eschatology, or whether the sections do not rather indicate the hand of one who still clung to materialistic conceptions of Resurrection, of Judgement, of the Second Coming of the Lord[2]. There is ground for hesitation; yet on the whole we are, perhaps, guided to the conclusion that such fluctuations are to some extent accounted for by variety in mood[3]. The Fourth Evangelist, be it added, is by no means the only man of letters to be at times inconsistent with himself[4].

Two more considerations. They point, in the one case, to the recorded manifestations[5] of the Risen Lord. In the other they point to those opening verses which form the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel.

And first, the manifestations. There is no need to linger on the events narrated in the appendix chapter; and it may suffice to say of them that, leaning on the Synoptic representation, the

[1] To Cludius. [2] Scholten, *op cit.* p. 72.

[3] I have ventured to say in the Preface to my *Eschatology of Jesus* (p. x), that 'if Eschatological Sayings be found in the lips of the Johannine Christ, it is precisely because the historic Jesus had actually been wont so to speak.'

[4] Frequent instances are afforded by books reviewed in the *Times Literary Supplement.*

[5] Let room be made here for a conjecture It may be the case or not that, knowing Luke, our Evangelist had also knowledge of its companion work Acts: the chances are that the tale told Acts ii, 1 ff., had somehow reached his ears if not (in documentary form) his eyes and that it was deprecated by him. He does not flatly contradict it; what he does is to substitute the far more spiritual story Jn xx, 19 ff.

writer has apparently thought fit to recast and supplement a story belonging to the period of the earthly Ministry[1] and to transfer it to an after date. Accordingly we turn from it to the immediately preceding chapter (xx); with its record of three several appearances of the Risen Lord—to Mary Magdalene; to an unspecified number of disciples; to, so it would appear, the same disciples, but, this time, Thomas with them. The point[2], then, is whether, looking to their nature, the stories are precisely what the Evangelist has prepared us to expect. His Christ has, indeed, spoken of his impending death; yet no word has come from him which can be so construed as to suggest both a conviction and a prediction of an external Resurrection, while the allusions actually met with are strongly indicative of a coming to, of an abiding presence in the believer's heart. Nay more; the tone and tenor of the great Farewell Discourses are scarcely in keeping with an expectation that, before three short days had passed, the speaker would have rejoined his disciples, in outwardly visible if mysteriously transfigured form.

It must be confessed that the stories give us pause. They are singularly beautiful stories. They testify to an actual Easter assurance, howsoever vouchsafed and apprehended[3], which brought conviction to the souls of the disciples and enabled them to say their 'Jesus lives.' A deep spiritual significance may be read into them. We are nevertheless constrained to ask again: has any word come from the Evangelist which expressly invites his readers to expect such stories? It is not altogether easy to answer in the affirmative; and the question arises: is he himself responsible for the stories—stories, quite in the Johannine manner, of spiritual experiences in concrete form[4]—or must their presence, not necessarily their origination, be accounted for by a redactor's hand?

[1] Cf. Lk. v, 1 ff.

[2] Anticipated, and discussed, but without definite conclusion, by Alex. Schweizer, *op. cit.* pp. 215 ff.

[3] The crucial passage for the interpretation of the Gospel Narratives of the Resurrection is 1 Cor. xv, 1 ff.

[4] According to Schwalb (*op. cit.* p. 33), 'er hat sie ja gedichtet oder doch frei umgebildet,' as one who feels, in his own soul, what he makes his characters feel.

Let us hold our judgement in suspense. Yet the remark is permissible that the stories do not seem quite to fit into the framework; to lead up quite naturally to the pointed reference[1] of the verses which, immediately following on these stories—bring the Gospel proper to its formal close. Has matter of another type been ousted by them?

Turning to the Prologue (i, 1–18), we are confronted by a twofold question:—do we possess it in its original form—from whose pen does it come?

No doubt features are presented by it which, at first sight, might dispose us to differentiate between hand and hand[2]. They are present in *vv.* 6–8 and 15; where, with abrupt transition from 'great abstract conceptions,' we seem, if only for a moment, 'to touch the solid earth,' and then 'are taken back to the region of abstractions which we had hardly left[3]'; and the suggestion is not far-fetched that they are no part of the original text. It might well be pleaded that no real loss is involved by their removal; that, on the contrary, they seem but to impair the ordered sequence of majestic cadences. Yet the author himself may have been altogether unconscious of a break, or else be deliberately passing and repassing as it were from heaven to earth[4]; and the conclusion to be here ventured is that, albeit a difficulty must be recognized, there is much to favour the hypothesis that, in the form in which we have it, the Prologue is a unity.

Who, then, is its author? It is a safe assumption that a work

[1] Jn xx, 30: Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐνώπιον τῶν μαθητῶν, ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ. The ταῦτα of *v.* 31 cannot in any case refer simply and solely to the stories, and an inference might be that it points to something quite different.

[2] Yet as by no means prepared to follow Cludius (*op. cit.* pp. 58 ff.), nor yet Spitta, who here, as elsewhere, arbitrarily distinguishes between 'Grundschrift,' matter derived from other sources, and the reflexions of the redactor.

[3] J. Armitage Robinson, *Study of the Gospels*, pp. 119 f.

[4] 'Das Evangelium,' writes Heitmüller (*SNT*, ii, p. 721), 'ist das Evangelium der Gegensätze. Davon haben wir hier ein bezeichnendes Beispiel. Der Übergang von v, 5 zu 6 ist schroff....Ohne jeden Übergang, ohne Vermittlung, ohne Rücksicht auf Stimmung und Verständnis des Lesers versetzt ihn der Verfasser jetzt in eine ganz bestimmte geschichtliche Lage. Die Stimmung der Wehmut schien ihn v, 5 zu beherrschen: hier (v, 6) schwingt er die scharfe Waffe des Kampfes.'

provided with a formal close (xx, 30, 31) could scarcely have been destitute of any formal introduction; and, inasmuch as the section i, 19–28 not only fails to satisfy requirements but evidently presupposes some sort of preface by the manner of its opening words, we are, it would seem, tied down to two alternatives. If the Prologue be not attributable to the author of the main fabric of the Gospel, then his original introduction has somehow disappeared, while the gap so left has been filled in by another person.

The second alternative may be dismissed off-hand. Of valid reason for refusing to assign the Prologue to our conjectured author there is surely none whatever; and, apart from questions relative to influences pervading it (of which more hereafter), the sole point on which there can be reasonable difference of opinion is one which turns on the exact nature of the relation in which it stands to the remainder of the Gospel[1]. Yet here again the balance surely inclines on the side of the view that, even as with vestibule and temple, Prologue and body of the Gospel constitute a single whole[2].

We may readily believe that, whether the Prologue was actually composed or not before the completion of the Gospel, its composition was not effected without prolonged deliberation and much use of pen[3].

But to bring this chapter to a close.

The identity of the Evangelist is, and probably will remain, an enigma. Whether the Beloved Disciple (who is not the Apostle John) or some other person be the author, the Gospel was certainly not written by a *tour de force*; prolonged and careful preparation was involved; long time on the literary stocks, it was built up in collaboration with members of an inner circle. He himself never published it; when first it emerged from its deposi-

[1] With allusion to Harnack's theory that the Prologue is no organic part of the Gospel, a postscript rather than a preface, Loisy (*op. cit.* p. 97) writes: 'On a vainement essayé d'isoler le Prologue.'

[2] See on the whole question Johnston, *op. cit.* pp. 6 ff.

[3] The Prologue, says Robson (*JTS*, xviii, p. 293), 'is certainly the work of a careful composer, seeking to rise to the height of his great argument, but certainly, as a composer pure and simple, timid and unconfident, and making his way from thought to thought and word to word.' The word 'cautious' might with advantage be substituted for the phrase 'timid and unconfident.'

tory he had, in all likelihood, already gone to his rest; and, when actually given to the world, it had, so to speak, ceased to be his Gospel to become our Fourth Gospel. Or in other words, the original treatise of the Evangelist had been somewhat freely dealt with—supplemented, interpolated, and perhaps modified—by editorial hands, yet so as to lend the semblance of compactness to the expanded work. If room must really be made (and this is doubtful) for a plurality of redactors they would differ in mental calibre and trend of thought. There is no settling the question as to who precisely they were, yet it may be said of them that, for all their diversity, they belonged to the Johannine school at Ephesus[1].

[1] It is possible to assume a redactor without necessarily being involved in the charge: 'So macht man diesen zu dem Ungeheuer, für das man den Verfasser zu halten sich scheut,' Wetter, *op. cit.* p. 2.

CHAPTER IX

THEN—AND NOW

In bringing our inquiry to a close we will proceed from a rapid summary of results and inferences to an attempt to form some estimate of the significance and value of our Gospel not only in its own day but in the modern world.

Aptly is it designated 'The Ephesian Gospel'; for it was surely at, or in the immediate vicinity of, the once famous Asiatic city that our Gospel originated. While to fix its date with precision is not possible, it may be safely assigned to the period which lies between *ca.* A.D. 90 and A.D. 120; and quite probably there is no need to travel beyond the first decade of the second century. Its traditional authorship is hard to maintain; not only is the external evidence altogether unconvincing, but there are other cogent grounds for the view which eliminates the son of Zebedee. Whether direct or indirect, the internal evidence occasions pause; and if, on the one hand, there are features which testify to Jewish penmanship, so, on the other hand, phenomena are met with which do not suggest the first-hand information of an eye-witness. Nor is doubt laid by that examination of the literary structure of the Gospel which, necessitating a cautious recognition of displacement, has issued in a qualified abandonment of the position which regards it as a unity. The admission made that all attempts to resolve it into its constituent elements are precarious, we have differentiated, however tentatively, between hand and hand; between main fabric and matter which, originally foreign to it, has been so welded in as to lend the semblance of unity to the Gospel in its present form. In the case of the main fabric the author has been spoken of as the Evangelist:—room being left for the contingency that, enigmatical personage as he would remain, he may perchance be that Beloved Disciple whom we cannot identify with the Apostle John. In the case of other matter we have reckoned with a possibility

however slight that not one redactor only is responsible for the processes to which the original work of the Evangelist was subjected before, or at the time of, publication; and conjecture has here turned to a mind, or minds, of smaller grasp and duller spiritual perception[1] albeit representative of the Johannine School at Ephesus.

Let us once more glance at the Evangelist as his personality may be discerned in the pages of a Gospel the main bulk of which comes from him if it reveals his dependence on sources, and if, writing and re-writing much himself, he did not always wield the pen.

Perhaps he is the Beloved Disciple and perhaps he is not; whatever his identity he is a born genius. That he is a highly educated[2] man is beyond question; he is at home in Hebrew literature and by no means unversed in Alexandrian speculation. He is evidently of an independent turn of mind; and, if the works of great thinkers are laid under contribution by him, it is certainly not as one content *jurare in verba magistri*; on the contrary he prefers to go his own way, and in so doing he utilizes, qualifies, or rejects. It is, no doubt, true to say of his Prologue that it gains in significance when compared with Philo's[3] reflexions; yet the contrast is sharp, and it is as truly added that, in respect of new elements in his own conception of the Logos, he far outstrips that 'most spiritual of authors[4],' and dwells by preference on a unique historical person rather than on the exaltation of individual souls[5]. He can and does say what Philo would have found it hard to say: ὁ λόγος σὰρξ

[1] Not necessarily the 'Ungeheuer' of Wetter's allusion. And see Alex. Schweizer, *op. cit.* p. 234.

[2] Perhaps it is to go too far when Réville (*op. cit.* p. 299) speaks of an 'éducation scientifique'

[3] A native of Alexandria. The precise dates of his birth and death are unknown. As we learn from his *Legatio ad Caium*, he was, A.D. 40, a member of a Jewish embassy to Caius Caligula. Evidently he was of good family; his brother was Alabarch of Alexandria where he himself lived. His literary activity was immense, but there is no trace in his extant works of his having been affected by Christian teaching. Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture*, p. xiii.

[4] As Conybeare (*Philo about the Contemplative Life*, p. x) calls Philo.

[5] Windisch, *Die Frömmigkeit Philos*, p. 114. A work which in any case repays perusal.

ἐγένετο[1]. If in his Prologue he moves in the region of philosophical inquiry, it is otherwise in the body of his work; he well-nigh ceases to be the metaphysician to become the mystic[2]; with definite and deliberate surrender he projects himself into the divine presence, and blends activity with contemplation in union with the Christ Incarnate who for him is revealer and revelation of his God. His musings are of things eternal, yet he is persuaded 'that the heavenly life does not require us to leave the earth nor to refuse ourselves to its concerns, but only to take care that they do not imprison us in petty satisfactions and momentary ends[3]'; things temporal are rightly appreciated by him; he 'sees that the ordinary human life is part of the divine interest,' and, with an eye to his own environment, he is fain so to idealize all human affairs as to turn their water into wine[4]. A real man of flesh and blood, his mood varies; if sometimes inconsistent with himself, it is because his mind refuses to be kept within a solitary groove; in his terminology he perforce turns to 'categories nearest to his hand[5]'; he illustrates —as perhaps realizing—the inadequacy of all human language to express the infinite. His are the infirmities of tone and temper which are common to the race; what he sees in vision is blurred in the telling of it; and it might perhaps be said that, appearing to strike a note of exclusiveness in unexpected moments, he goes near to invite the charge that there is scant room in his affection for those outside the Church[6]. It is nevertheless a true instinct

[1] Cohu, *op. cit.* pp. 482 ff. See in particular Johnston, *op. cit.* pp. 87 ff. It is impossible to agree with Ballenstedt (*op. cit.* p. 87) that the Evangelist's 'Vortrag vom Logos ist ganz Philonisch,' and, *int. al.*, Wendt (*op. cit.* pp. 98 ff.) is decisive for the other way about. Yet one might say with Ballenstedt (p. 6) that in like manner as the Evangelist took over the phrase 'Lamb of God' from Jewish sacrificial diction, so he might have had resort to Alexandrian speculation for the term 'Logos.' Yet it should be added, with Brückner (*op. cit.* p. 91), that, if the latter provided him with a form suited to his environment, its content, for him, was 'das Bild Jesu Christi mit seiner Gnade und Wahrheit.'

[2] This, again, is slightly reminiscent of Dr Stanton's Exposition.

[3] Emerson, *Memoir*, i, p. 258.

[4] This sentence, with some of the preceding sentences, is adapted from Watson, *Mysticism of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 152 ff.

[5] Cf. Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, i, p. 147.

[6] *JE*, ix, pp. 251 f. 'This teaching of love is combined with the most in-

which decides that, in the last analysis, the hatred displayed by him is not so much of persons as of principles; and that, far from being incompatible with, it is a necessary constituent of rightly-apprehended and comprehensive love[1]. That he is capable of and responsive to such a love is surely patent. As patent is it that 'he is a candidate for truth[2]'; as fully satisfied that the honest search for truth will ever be rewarded by augmented treasure, and that for those who in after ages shall engage in it there will be that never-failing divine guidance which has been richly experienced by himself[3]. He is far more concerned for unity than for uniformity. Refusing to discard altogether the things which belong to outward form and ceremony, he perhaps sits loosely to them. What he emphatically desiderates is worship 'in spirit and truth.'

Of such sort was the Evangelist; he, the Great Unknown—as we will still speak of him—who, of Jewish origin but long resident in 'Greek Ephesus[4],' is author of the main fabric of the Fourth Gospel. The pity is that his work does not lie before us in its original form.

With what purpose was it composed, and wherein lies the service rendered by the author in his own period?

It is an exaggeration which accounts his Gospel a diatribe against groups of men who persisted in allegiance to the Baptist[5]; and the truth appears to be that, with Baptist-disciples in his view

tense hatred of the kinsmen of Jesus'...'a gospel of Christian love and Jew hatred.' The writer of the article allows for a possibility that the original work was elaborated into such a Gospel by 'a late compiler.'

[1] So, perhaps, Calmes, when (*op. cit.* p. 63) he writes: 'L'antijudaïsme de Saint Jean n'est pas autre chose, au fond, que l'universalisme.'

[2] Emerson, *Essay on Intellect.*

[3] Is it altogether in accordance with the mind of the Evangelist when, with allusion to the section Jn xx, 26 ff.—which is in any case Johannine in manner—Calmes (*op. cit.* pp. 77 f.) thinks good to say: 'L'exemple de Thomas semble destiné à mettre les lecteurs en garde contre les exigences de la raison'?

[4] See the whole chapter so entitled in Prof. Percy Gardner's *The Ephesian Gospel.*

[5] So Baldensperger. And so, at a far earlier date, Cludius (*op. cit.* p. 52), who, in the allusion 'there was much water there' (Jn iii, 23), discovered 'ein Spott...der sich auf die Hemerobaptisten bezieht...wegen ihrer täglichen Reinigungen.' According to Wetter (*op. cit.* pp. 167 ff.) the Johannine polemic was also directed against Moses.

as concerned to win them, he really breaks a lance with Jewish disputants who made much of the priority of John to Jesus[1]. Notwithstanding coincidence in terminology he is not himself deeply impregnated with Gnosticism[2]; and if later on its foremost exponents found congenial matter in our Gospel, the utmost that can be said is that he is sharply at issue with the view which relegated the Logos to a place among inferior aeons[3]—who on a second reading of his Prologue would not ask: Is this the language of a theologian who aims at refuting Gnosticism[4]? In his own somewhat ambiguous way he upholds the humanity of his Lord; yet the anti-Docetism of his Gospel is less conspicuous than in that first Johannine Epistle which, quite conceivably, came from his pen. Lusty blows are struck by him at whatever heresy which, fastening on the Manhood, denied the Divinity of Jesus, and affirmed that he was mere man. But, generally speaking, his polemic, where discoverable, is more particularly directed against unbelieving and aggressive Judaism; and, if there be occasion for the remark that 'he fights heretics with their own weapons[5]' there is sufficient warrant for taking him at his word when, referring, not in any case specifically to immediately preceding stories (xx, 11–29), but to his Gospel as a whole, he (xx, 31) thus defines his purpose: 'that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God[6], and that believing ye may have life in his name.'

The question is: Who are the 'ye'? It will not do forthwith to seek for them in the outer world; for it was hardly the express intention of the Evangelist to appeal directly to heathendom. Nor may we dwell at once on local Christian Churches generally,

[1] See Calmes, *op. cit.* p. 65; Wendt, *op. cit.* p. 109; Percy Gardner, *op. cit.* pp. 199 ff.; Forbes, *op. cit.* p. 159; De Wette, *op. cit.* ii, p. 219.

[2] Against Schwegler, *op. cit.* p. 211.

[3] Cf. Forbes, *op. cit.* p. 160.

[4] Calmes, *op cit.* p. 63. The pointed question is led up to thus: 'Sans vouloir prétendre que l'Évan. Joh. contienne aucun des traits qui caractérisent l'hérésie de Marcion et de Valentin, nous constatons qu'il offre un certain nombre d'expressions qui rappellent d'une manière frappante la terminologie des écrits gnostiques.'

[5] Cohu, *op. cit.* p. 431.

[6] Incidentally the Jewish Messiah, but—inasmuch as this would not appeal to Hellenic minds—primarily Son of God.

when quite possibly he never contemplated any immediate publication and circulation of his work. Rather do we turn to an inner circle which included the members of his School, his disciples and attached friends. It is surely they who are addressed by him in the first instance;—yet the thought would be present with him, that, engaged as they were in a regular and systematic ministry of teaching, the substance of his Gospel would, by their agency, permeate and influence an ever widening circle of receptive minds[1].

His addressees, then, being primarily his intimates and associates, it was his aim and object both to instruct and confirm them in that reasonable faith which they had drunk in at his lips. To that faith he himself had risen as it were on 'stepping-stones'; it fully satisfied him; it dominated his soul. It was concentrated on a Person; the Christ of his experience. His experience had taught him that in the living out of it there was fulness of Life:—the Life Eternal told of in the pages of his Gospel.

It was the great service rendered by the Evangelist that by him the religion of Jesus was emancipated from its swaddling clothes and provided with a vesture more adapted to its expansion and its growth. Truly it is said of him that he took up the immortal work of Paul[2]; whether he brought that work to its full and final completion is another matter, and it is safer to decide that it was so continued by him as to illustrate a very considerable advance. The Synoptic tradition was not simply explained by him, but, in and by his interpretation of it, purified and refined[3] as he transferred the Jesus of Capernaum to Ephesus[4], and sought to make the Christ of his experience a reality for Hellenistic and Hellenic modes of thought. If it really be the case that old and materialistic conceptions still clung to him (which is open to question)[5], their influence is faint; they practically fade away be-

[1] In partial agreement with Hengstenberg, *op. cit.* iii, pp. 396 f.

[2] Réville, *op. cit.* p. 326. Yet Paul and our Evangelist are different in type of mind.

[3] 'Da schrieb Joh. sein Evglm., und *erläutete* nicht nur, sondern *läutete* selbst die palästinische Evangeliensage,' Herder, *op. cit.* p. 264.

[4] Cf. Ammon, *op. cit.* i, p. 78.

[5] It is easier to discover in echoes of the Synoptic Representation of Judgement and Resurrection the workings of a redactor's mind, yet they

fore other and spiritualized conceptions. On the one hand the dross of specifically Palestinian Christianity is purged away by him; on the other hand he freely avails himself of whatsoever elements in the great spiritual tendencies of the age were capable of assimilation[1]. He has parted with Judaism in its purely nationalistic hopes and expectations; and, with adoption of a term already familiar to the schools, he uses it as the key which discloses to Ephesian hearers and readers the innermost nature of the Logos Incarnate Who had tabernacled among men[2]. And so he furnishes his proofs that, while faith in Jesus responded to the deepest yearnings of the human soul, it also satisfied the highest exigencies of knowledge, and that this same Jesus, far from being the Messiah of the Jews only, was Redeemer of the World at large[3]. The Apocalyptic Son of Man is not without an interest for him, but his main thoughts are focussed on the Son of God.

'The Christian Gospels, broadly considered, stand for a certain measure of free thinking re-action against the Jewish religion[4].' The qualified admission, when itself qualified, holds good of our Evangelist; who, no mere reactionary and necessarily bound by the limitations of the period, is a very noble specimen of the true free-thinker and liberator within the Christian Church. Not only abreast of, he was, in no small measure, in advance of his times; and there can be little doubt that, at all events in certain quarters, he was an object of suspicion and distrust: it may be that, in his own immediate following, there were some who, brought up on the Synoptic representation, looked askance at a work so different in its nature and conceptions as that which they received at his hands. That, prior to its publication, it should be subjected to a revision which savoured of conventionalism was, perhaps, natural in the circumstances; nor is there ground for wonder that, even when so

may be 'little concessions' (Réville, *op. cit.* p. 331) of the Evangelist. And see *supra*, p. 119, note 3.

[1] Schmiedel, *EB*, ii, col. 2558. Our Evangelist is as it were the 'scribe' of Mt. xiii, 52. [2] Cf. von Soden, *Early Christian Literature*, p. 404.

[3] Schenkel, *op. cit.* p. 25.

[4] J. M. Robertson, *Short History of Free Thought*, i, p. 218. It is characteristically added, 'albeit their practical outcome was only an addition to the world's supernaturalism and traditional dogma.'

worked over as to become our Fourth Gospel, it was slow—as seems to have been the case—to win its way to general acceptance. Inviting controversy it was much in debate[1]. As to-day so then, invidious and unreasoning comparisons would be drawn between a 'new theology' and the 'old Gospel[2].'

Was it really in the mind of the Evangelist to compose a 'permanent Gospel[3]'? Readily may we believe that his glances reached ahead; as persuaded that those who came after him would find help and guidance in a work which, rich in his own spiritual experiences, set forth great conceptions which had satisfied himself. By no possibility could it have occurred to him that, before many decades had elapsed, it would take rank as Holy Scripture; nor yet that a time would come when the Fourth Gospel would be classed with 'the most priceless treasures which early Christian literature had bequeathed to' a modern world[4] not blind to the problems it presents.

We pass by a natural transition to inquire into the significance and value of our Gospel in our own day; as prompt to reject the verdict of an early, and withal ill-equipped and flippant, critic that it is 'altogether void of worth and utility[5],' and as feeling that we should be glad to listen 'were John (let us say, the author) to appear to our age and place his Gospel in our hands[6].' As it is, our inquiry must concern itself with the Gospel in its present form.

It has assuredly a historical value. Regarded from one point of view it is, in some sort, a revelation of the circumstances and the conditions of the period in which it originated. When closely scrutinized it enables us to look on at the literary processes of antiquity; it takes us as it were to Palestine; it has much to tell of

[1] 'Le trouble produit par l'apparition du iv^e. Évang. se traduisit par des discussions acharnées,' Calmes, *op. cit.* p. 66.

[2] Thus, but recently, by the Bishop of Chelmsford, Dr Watts-Ditchfield.

[3] 'Ein bleibendes Evglm. wollte Joh. schreiben, der Geschichte Geist und Wahrheit,' Herder, *op. cit.* p. 349.

[4] A. V. Green, *op. cit.* p. 82.

[5] 'Weder Werth noch Nutzen.' So in the work which, published anonymously in 1801, was from the pen of Vogel, then Lutheran 'Superintendent in Wunsiedel in Franken.' See Lücke, *op. cit.* i, pp. 93 ff. My search, in which friends have most kindly assisted me, for a copy of the work (*Der Evangelist Joh. und seine Ausleger vor dem jüngsten Gericht*) has been unsuccessful.

[6] Herder, *op. cit.* pp. 369–77.

the throbbing life which pulsated in that great city on the Aegean which had been the 'pivot of civilisation, the crucial meeting-place of East and West[1].' Whether in its main fabric or in features which go near or all the way to become evidence of redaction, it is a study in the anxieties and perplexities, the peculiar difficulties and facilities, the courage resolute for progress and the timorousness reluctant to advance, which were very present with the early Church.

What of its historical value from another point of view? That it is of no small importance, as an ancient document, for the student of antiquity no one will deny. The grave question is whether it be safe to turn to it as a reliable source for the Life of Jesus.

The answer must be tinged with hesitation. It is one thing to say that 'we cannot...write a Life of Christ as if the Gospel of St John had no existence'; quite apart from the exceeding venturesomeness of all attempts at such a biography[2], it is difficult to agree that to set our Gospel aside would be to 'reject half our available evidence[3].' For the larger part of evidence relative to the earthly life of Jesus we must admit dependence on the Synoptics; and there is the further necessity of admitting that even in the Synoptics he is ever and again pictured as seen by the eye of faith. This necessity is intensified with our Gospel; which, perpetual theophany[4] that it is, represents and witnesses to the Christ of experience whose glory is manifested, not on one solitary occasion only[5], but from first to last. The belief is, indeed, well grounded that, albeit removed from a transitory setting and transferred to the region of the spiritual, a deposit of genuine reminiscences both of deed and word is embedded in it. It is however not, in the modern sense, a strictly historical record of the earthly ministry of Jesus.

[1] Percy Gardner, *op. cit.* p. 1.

[2] *CBE*, p. 459. 'Wer sollte nicht in das Bekenntniss der Anna Maria von Schurmann einstimmen,' wrote Neander (*op. cit.* p. viii), 'welche von einem solchen Unternehmen zurückfuhr, weil es ihr vorkam dass sie die Sonne nur mit einem Kohle abmale?'

[3] Cf. J. Armitage Robinson, *Hist. Character of St John's Gospel*, p. 49.

[4] 'Le quatrième Évangile est une theophanie perpétuelle,' Loisy, *op. cit.* pp. 104 f.

[5] There is no room in the conception of the Evangelist for any narrative of the Transfiguration.

The Fourth Gospel is a part, scarcely 'half,' of our available evidence; and, while appeal to it must be made with cautious reservations, it is not imperative definitely and finally to rule it out in its entirety as a source for the Life of Jesus.

There is more to be said. Let it be granted that the real Jesus, in respect of each several point in his human developement, was other than our Evangelist depicts[1]. It may then be added that he, the Evangelist, profoundly conscious that personality is after all the highest force, and that it is far less a question of what the man says and does than of what the man is, has seized on great ideas which absorbed the soul of Jesus; and, in his portraiture, has presented them in concrete form[2]. Whether eye-witness or not, he is linked in spiritual affinity with Jesus. In his spiritual Gospel the Christ of his experience is accordingly invested with a personality which, tremendous in its impressiveness[3], cannot for a moment be regarded as nought but the mere creation of pious fancy, of an imaginative mind.

'The problem of the Person of Christ' remains with us. It was faced by our Evangelist; and in this, were there nothing else, there is a deep and encouraging significance for the modern world. There cannot be the shadow of a doubt that his own attempted solution brought satisfaction to himself and real help to his contemporaries: we moderns, studying his Christology—and remarking, perhaps, that, whatever be the explanation[4], there is an apparent absence of uniformity in the notes struck by it—are constrained to speak of a problem by no means fully solved by him and still awaiting its solution. Yet the land-marks he set up are not negligible; and, if the path he indicates be long and intricate, to keep on treading it is not to lose sight of the goal.

There is truth in the remark that, in his Christ-ideal, our Evangelist has anticipated the ideal as conceived of and set forth

[1] Cf. Schenkel, *op. cit.* p. 25. Schenkel adds: 'aber er war so in der Tiefe und auf der Höhe seines Wirkens; er war nicht immer so in *Wirklichkeit*, aber er war so in *Wahrheit*.'

[2] See W. F. Loman, *Het vierde Evangelie, Kenbron van Jezus' Leer en Leven*, pp. 6, 34.

[3] See Wernle, *Quellen des Lebens Jesu*, p. 29.

[4] Conjecture has pointed to the mind and pen of a redactor. See Spitta, *op. cit.* p. 404.

by some of the greatest and highest Christian thinkers of a far later day[1].

But to pass on. As with the *Imitatio Christi*, so with our Gospel; uncertainty in respect of its origination leaves its value essentially unimpaired[2]. The lessons to be drawn from it are manifold; let us fasten on some main points in which it is rich in suggestiveness for present-day circumstances and needs.

To begin with. In these awful days of world-wide strife of nations our thoughts are first directed to 'the time of our wealth,' and the invitation follows to unite in fervent prayer to be vouchsafed 'a lasting peace[3],' while the 'visible consecration to an ideal' is forcefully desiderated[4]. Well and good; yet it is greatly to be feared that not only is the term 'wealth' widely identified with purses filled to repletion, but that the 'peace' craved for by many implies little more than slumberous repose to follow after the clash of arms. Unquestionably the great war has wrought great things in us; we have been stirred to reflexion, dormant faculties have been quickened into life, the spirit of self-sacrifice is in marvellous display, all classes are pervaded by the sense of brotherhood. As unquestionably there is ground for hope that these and such-like features are not destined to speedy disappearance; as Browning confidently tells us: 'there shall never be one lost good[5].' What cannot be said is that the nation has as yet risen to, let alone consecrated itself to, an 'ideal' which takes full account of things intellectual, moral, and spiritual. And apart from such an ideal, there can be, in the true sense of the word, no national 'wealth.'

Let us be on our guard against sweeping generalizations. It were idle to deny that the high ideal desiderated is both grasped and aimed at by right-minded men who, sturdy in their refusal to contemplate a reversion to the lamentable social conditions which obtained in days of so-called 'Peace,' are as sturdy in demand and deed for that new order which shall mean a richer and a fuller life within the reach of those conventionally designated 'the labouring

[1] Schwalb, *op. cit.* p. 257. [2] Cf. Réville, *op. cit.* p. 320.

[3] Form of Intercession in time of War.

[4] Bishop of Chelmsford's Pastoral Letter in connexion with that National Mission which, no doubt, testified to good intentions.

[5] 'Abt Vogler.'

classes[1].' The error is nevertheless wide-spread which imagines God's Kingdom to be a synonym for universal comfort[2]; and nought but mischief can issue from its prevalence. 'When this terrible war is over a wave of materialism will sweep over the land. Nothing will count but machinery and output. I am all for output, and I have done my best to improve machinery and output. But that is not all. There is nothing more fatal to a people than that it should narrow its vision to the material needs of the hour. National ideals without imagination are but as the thistles of the wilderness, fit neither for food nor fuel. A nation that depends on them must perish. We shall need at the end of the war better workshops, but we shall also need more than ever every institution that will exalt the vision of the people above and beyond the workshop and the counting-house. We shall need every national tradition that will remind them that men cannot live by bread alone.' Thus spoke England's present Prime Minister[3]; with acute diagnosis of the situation, and keen perception of vitally important needs.

The case is one in which our Gospel is of profoundest significance. The spiritual exaltation which characterizes it is precisely what our times need. It upholds a great ideal; as the Christ of its conception so manifests his glory as to drive it home that suffering and toil and service are not merely incidental to humanity but inherent in divinity. A vision revealed by it is of the social organism when emancipated from the thraldom of sordid and degrading self-interest (whether of individuals or classes), and in full and fruitful enjoyment of that 'perfect freedom' which attends right thought displayed in right action:—'ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free.'

In the second place. Form and ceremony are not things lightly to be discarded. They have their own proper value in that they lend dignity and impressiveness to State or civic pageant; not only are they essential to orderliness and reverence, but they set forth uplifting ideas in the gatherings for common worship. It shall be

[1] An instance might be found in Mr George Lansbury as cited in *The Modern Churchman*, ii, 5, p. 209.

[2] Burkitt, *CBE*, p. 209.

[3] Lloyd George, *Speech at the Welsh National Eisteddfod*, 1916.

left to shallow minds to rail at them[1]; to raise shallow objection which is blind to or ignores their perfectly legitimate and often helpful appeal to the senses and emotions[2]. There are nevertheless signs and symptoms of an unwholesome tendency unduly to magnify the importance of externals; and it is just here that our Gospel comes in with its reminder that worship 'in spirit and in truth' is alone precious in the sight of God.

Again. The spectacle is presented of a rent and tattered Christendom. As might be expected, the 'religious outsider' jeers at the spectacle, and finds in it the 'strongest argument against co-operation or belief'; the situation is widely realized in all its ugliness and shamefulness within Christendom itself, and in truth 'our unhappy divisions' ought to be 'an outrage to the moral consciousness of every Christian[3].' Who would not agree that 'it is surely no longer tolerable that bodies of Christians, equally devout, equally effective in missionary work (which is the supreme test), loving one Father, serving one Lord and Saviour, inspired by one Holy Spirit, should go on thwarting each other while the tide of unbelief and wickedness rises unchecked[4]'? The protest is much to the point; yet it invites question as to the alleged efficiency of missionary effort, while doubt is engendered whether genuine inspiration be compatible with sectarian jealousies and rivalries; not to speak of individual communions themselves 'broken into parties eager to narrow the limits of their inheritance by the peculiarities of their own opinions[5].'

The 're-union of Christendom' is much in men's minds. In that very fact there is ground of hope; and the ground is widened as the reflexion deepens that 'the old distinctions between the

[1] Cf. Emerson, *Memoir*, i, p. 315.

[2] See generally W. James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*.

[3] Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius*, p. xiii.

[4] C. T. Wood, in *Religious Reconstruction after the War, A Cambridge Programme*, p. 38. See also pp. 44 ff. for remarks on the same topic by the Hulsean Professor, Dr Emery Barnes.

[5] Westcott, *Historic Faith*, p. 117. A lamentable instance is afforded by Bishop Gore in his protest against the consecration of Dr Hensley Henson to the see of Hereford;—as a friend writes to me: 'he is "out" to make the Church of England—the only Catholic Church in existence—a *peculium* of himself and party.'

several denominations no longer correspond with the vital affinities which draw men of kindred faith and purpose together[1].' The ground will become ever wider as, inspired by our Gospel, men resolutely turn their backs on that conception of 're-union' which postulates external uniformity, and dwell by preference on unity in diversity. 'If we look forward to the fulfilment of the great promise which gladdens the future, it is not that there shall ever be, as we wrongly read, "one fold," one outward society of Christians gathered in one outward form, but, what answers more truly to present experience and reasonable hope, "one flock and one shepherd[2]."'

It were well to make haste slowly. There is room for the 'venture of faith'—so long as it be tempered with sagacity. It is scarcely so tempered when met with in the garb of platform mutual-admiration rhetoric[3], nor yet in well-meant proposals and arrangements which disguise grave differences with the cloak of unreal harmony. Wide, no doubt, is the field in which hearty co-operation is practicable; otherwise wisdom suggests that 'steps towards Christian unity' are most surely taken in the more private converse of those who, conscious of 'vital affinities,' meet together for the discussion, at once frank and penetrating, of the problems which the unity desiderated presents.

One such problem, not inconceivably of paramount importance, is such as to suggest that the uncertainties of which thoughtful minds are conscious are a very real barrier in the way of accomplished unity in diversity.

To say this is to arrive at a fourth, and last, point. There is no getting away from the fact that our lot is cast in a period of transition. The ground has shifted beneath our feet; and, by consequence, there is an uneasy feeling that it is idle to talk about a 'kindred faith' when faith itself appears to have been rudely shaken to its foundations. And the pressing need is to draw clear distinctions between scaffolding and fabric, between non-essentials

[1] Turbeville, *Steps towards Christian Unity*, p. 17.

[2] Westcott, *op. cit.* p. 118. And see in this connexion Sir Thomas More on *The Religion of the Utopians*.

[3] 'Ecclesiastical amenities are to be commended, but, like compliments, they must not be taken seriously,' *Mod. Churchman*, vii, p. 203.

and vital principle; and, that done—so far as is possible with present limitations—to provide the new embodiment for newly-apprehended truth.

Mutatis mutandis the Fourth Evangelist himself was in similar case; and the pages of his Gospel (and the Fourth Gospel is in its main bulk his Gospel) are a revelation of what was nothing short of a magnificent attempt on his part to distinguish between the obsolete and the permanent, and—discarding the one and holding fast the other—to provide that reasonable faith which was in him with a setting adequate to the exigencies of his own environment and age.

Therein guidance by him for the modern world. It is not that we must necessarily acquiesce at all points in his own conception and presentation of eternal verities; were he to make his appearance in our midst he would surely speak to very different effect. Reminding us that well-nigh eighteen centuries have elapsed since he composed his Gospel, he would have us realize that, confronted by circumstances and conditions not so much diverse from as infinitely more complex than those which obtained in his times, we have entered upon a vaster inheritance of knowledge than that which had come down to himself. He would bid us see to it that we turn our splendid inheritance to right good account; and accordingly be quick to 'recognize'—in fuller measure than for him was possible—'that a process of evolution is at work in religion no less than in the realm of nature and in all human institutions[1].' On the one hand he would raise a warning voice against the glib acceptance of doctrine, view, or theory which, 'fashioned to the varying hour,' breaks down when put to the test; on the other hand we should be told by him to rid ourselves of accumulated lumber in the form of beliefs not only old but outworn and obsolete. In like manner mindful of his own convictions, he would urge that the New Learning of time present be regarded, in all its manifoldness, as the gift of God; and that, by consequence, it is our wisdom, not to stand aloof, but to welcome it, to strive to assimilate the added lessons which it has to teach. Again pointing to his own example as one who did not scruple to draw water from the well

[1] Bonney, in *Religious Reconstruction*, p. 140.

of old-world philosophies, he would have us tread in his steps; our thoughts would be directed by him to the newly-opened field of Comparative Religion; his plea would be for the ungrudging recognition of every element of truth in the non-Christian religious systems of mankind. The intellectual and spiritual riches of individuals and classes, of churches and of sects, of the nations in all their variety of endowment and temperament, must, he would say emphatically, be laid under contribution in the attempt to transplant as it were the Jesus of Galilee and Jerusalem to village, town, or city of an expanded world.

Not that our Evangelist would point only to himself. On the contrary, we should ever find him pointing away from himself to the marvellous Personality of his Lord; to the Christ no longer of his own experience only but of that of one generation after another right down to our own day. Asking us to take his own guidance for what it was worth as realizing his limitations, he would dwell and dwell again on the continuous presence of a divine spirit whose allotted function is to 'guide' the men of every period 'into all the truth.'

Was it really our Evangelist who, telling (xvi, 13) of the functions of the Paraclete, went on to say: 'he shall show you things to come'? The phrase is somewhat reminiscent of specifically Jewish-Christian conceptions; and, if that be really the case, a possibility remains that it illustrates the workings of a more conservative and less spiritualizing redactor-mind. Be that as it may, it is, perhaps not altogether fanciful to find it suggestive of a vision rising, however dimly, before modern Christians who are at least united in their resolve to go forward on the path marked out for them in a Gospel which has but lately been alluded to as 'the most modern book in the world[1].'

We are told—and we know it to be true—that 'creeds are in the melting pot.' The assertion is met with that one creed at any rate is flouted (it must be said, by anticipation) by the Fourth Gospel[2]; the ancient *Symbolum apostolicum* which, known to us

[1] By R. Webb-Odell, *Modern Churchman*, vii, p. 172.

[2] Scholten, *Het Evan. naar Joh.* p. 471. In a foot-note on the same page Scholten decides that, of all the twelve Articles of the Apostles' Creed, the

as the Apostles' Creed, is occasion of perplexity, and is certainly characterized by a terminology and by conceptions which are not exactly responsive to present-day modes of thought. Such an assertion is, of course, arguable; at the same time a point is raised by it which we cannot afford to neglect. Interesting, beyond question, are experiments in creed-construction which have resort to the actual phraseology of 'the Johannine writings'; yet there is ground for the objection that the said writings are after all bound by the limitations of a remote antiquity. It is quite another matter for 'the Christian consciousness of this age,' 'free to express itself in a modern Christian Creed[1],' boldly to experiment in creed-construction, not in terms of, but on the lines which are surely indicated by the Fourth Evangelist. The work would involve time and patience, the exercise of thought, much anxious discrimination. Who dare say that such labour would be void of result? Engaged in by minds representative of every shade of thought and of every persuasion, there would surely be a growing sense of *rapprochement* in the very doing of it. The view would gain ground that variety in organization is quite compatible with agreement in regard to institution[2]. There might ultimately come about the formulating and the general adoption of a credal statement which, inclusive in its wording and sufficient for its day, would serve the three-fold purpose of rallying-point, safe-guard, and weapon for now outwardly sundered members of a divided Christendom..

We have not yet exhausted the suggested vision. It would be but in part realized with the accomplished unity in diversity of Christendom in respect of vital principle. There is promise of fuller realization in the fact that accomplished diversity in unity is bound to mean enhancement of efficiency in Christendom's mission to 'the world' when, as things are, there is only too good reason for the wailing cry which harps on 'the failure of the Church.'

only one not contradicted by our Gospel is the 'suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried,' and that even so the 'Pontius' must be eliminated.

[1] *Modern Churchman*, vii, 4, pp. 156 f.

[2] Such, apparently, is the view of our Evangelist. In his own spiritualizing way he realizes and affirms the value of sacramental rites, while comprehensiveness is a feature in his conception of fellowship.

Is it altogether true to say of our Evangelist that he is an out and out universalist? At times he wavers; it might seem that he invites the conclusion that, if his faith in human 'capacity for God' be unshakable, his inclusiveness stops short at 'the many' and fails to extend to the 'all[1].' In any case there is a note of dualism[2] in his conceptions; sharp is the antithesis between Church and World which recurs in the pages of his Gospel. Yet there is this to be said:—as his glances range ahead a conviction dawns on him that, while the latter cannot but be a diminishing quantity, the former is destined to extend its borders; and he breathes forth that conviction in Sayings placed by him on the lips of his Lord: as the 'lamp of life' is passed on by generations of believers (xvii, 20) there should be continuous additions to their ranks; and, if the day be far off, it will nevertheless come when the Christ shall have (xii, 34) 'drawn all men' unto himself. And hence we, in speaking of the noble treatise bequeathed to us—not, alas, in its integrity—by one, the 'Great Unknown,' who was in such close spiritual affinity with Jesus, may legitimately describe it as the Gospel of 'the larger hope.'

'Though it (the vision) tarry, wait for it[3].' The vision, not of the old-world Hebrew prophet, but that which, as we cannot but believe, rose before the author of the main fabric of the Fourth Gospel; a vision which points, in its fullest realization, to the highest fellowship of individuals and peoples linked heart to heart and hand to hand because one and all 'bound by gold chains about the feet of God.' Yet there must be no passive waiting for the vision; it behoves us to work for it. And we shall so work to better purpose when, steeping ourselves in the great thoughts which stirred in the mind and soul of our Evangelist, we aim at translating them into action with an eye to every circumstance and exigency which confronts us in our modern world.

[1] 'Die Gottesfähigkeit allerdings nicht aller, aber doch vieler Menschen,' Schwalb, *op. cit.* p. 257.

[2] 'Grim dualism.' So C. G. Montefiore, *HJ*, xvi, p. 235.

[3] Habakkuk ii, 3.

EXCURSUS I

THE DEATH OF JOHN SON OF ZEBEDEE

In the foregoing pages it is suggested that, as Jülicher puts it, 'the fortunes of the Presbyter, his exile to Patmos and residence at Ephesus have been transferred to the Apostle' (*sc.* John, son of Zebedee), and that the latter, the venerable tradition of his peaceful death in extreme old age at the capital of Asia Minor notwithstanding, met a 'tragic end[1].'

The suggestion is based on certain pieces of evidence which, together with other considerations, have led an increasing number of scholars to incline to or to adopt the view that John the Apostle, like his brother James, died a martyr's death.

Let us see how the case stands[2].

We turn in the first instance to the incident related Mk x, 35–40 = Mt. xx, 20–23. Upon a request made by, or on behalf of, the two sons of Zebedee there follows presently a prediction which is placed in the mouth of Jesus. As recorded by Mk it runs thus: 'The cup that I drink ye shall drink; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized.' Otherwise the First Evangelist; according to him Jesus says: 'My cup indeed shall ye drink[3].' The historicity of the incident being here assumed—the point will be referred to later on—Jesus appears expressly to announce the destiny which awaits the brother-pair. It is evidently the self-same destiny; nay more, it is the very same destiny which Jesus already knew to be in store for himself[4]. No

[1] Jülicher, *Einl. in das NT* (5th and 6th ed.), pp. 369, 391.

[2] I shall be permitted to draw on a paper read by me before the Cambridge Theological Society and also (with modifications) before the Oxford Society of Hist. Theology (vid. *Proceedings for the year* 1912–1913). See also my Note in *JTS*, xviii, pp. 30 ff.

[3] The words 'and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with' (AV) are without sufficient authority, and are rightly omitted by RV.

[4] The figure of 'the cup' has but one meaning in his lips (cf. Mk xiv, 36), and the recorded pregnant saying, Lk. xii, 50 ('I have a baptism to be baptized with, etc.'), points to anticipated death.

word comes from him which qualifies the prediction in respect of either brother, and its natural meaning surely is that both James and John would one day share their Master's fate.

The presumed genuine prediction refuses, it would seem, to be watered down or explained away. That once conceded, there would be real ground of surprise were it found to be affirmed of one or other of the two brothers (as it is affirmed of course, of John in the 'venerable tradition') that, while he 'had his share of suffering[1],' he yet went to his grave in peace. It would be, upon the other hand, nothing short of reasonable to look for, and expect to find, some positive statement to the effect that the prediction had been fulfilled to the letter in the case of both James and John.

A statement relative to the elder brother is quickly found Acts xii, 2; where it is said of Herod that 'he killed James the brother of John with the sword[2].' Is there any like statement in respect of John? There is:—if reliance may be placed on two authorities who, whatever their claims to respect, are at all events in singular agreement in the gist of what they narrate.

1. Georgius Hamartolus[3]. In a MS. of his Chronicle it is stated that 'John the Apostle after he had written his Gospel suffered martyrdom, for Papias in the second book of the λόγια κυριακά says that he was put to death by Jews, thus plainly fulfilling along with his brother the prophecy of Christ regarding them, and their own confession and common agreement concerning him[4].'

2. Philip of Side[5]. In an epitome probably based on his

[1] Slater, 'St Matthew' (*CB*), p. 258.

[2] According to Preuschen (*HBNT*, 'Apostelgeschichte,' p. 75) the account bears traces of modification in that all mention of the death of John is eliminated. And see the reading in Cod. D; where, after Ἰουδαίοις, there follows ἡ ἐπιχείρησις αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς πιστούς.

[3] A monkish chronicler of the tenth century.

[4] *EB*, ii, col. 2509. 'The passage was first brought into notice by de Muralt...and afterwards more widely by Nolte' (*Tüb. Quartalschrift*, 1862, p. 466). The Greek is as follows: Παπίας γὰρ ὁ Ἱεραπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος, αὐτόπτης τούτου γενόμενος, ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων φάσκει ὅτι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνῃρέθη, πληρώσας δηλαδὴ μετὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ περὶ αὐτῶν πρόρρησιν.

[5] A church historian of the fifth century who is somewhat contemptuously noticed by Socrates (*HE*, vii, 27).

Chronicle we read: 'Papias says in his second book that John the Divine and James his brother were slain by Jews[1].'

As might be expected, the statement thus doubly attributed to the Bishop of Hierapolis has been much in debate. The text being deemed corrupt, emendations have been offered[2]; the statement, it is affirmed, 'rests on very slender authority[3]'; one suggestion is that the James referred to is not the Apostle but the brother of the Lord[4] and another points from John son of Zebedee to John the Baptist[5]. Other scholars prefer to hold their judgement in suspense: 'it is one of those statements that we can neither wholly trust nor wholly distrust...the evidence...does not warrant a positive assertion either way[6].' Less hesitation is manifested in another quarter: 'with this testimony before us it is not easy to doubt that Papias made some such statement; if these MSS. are strictly independent witnesses it is difficult or well-nigh impossible to doubt that Papias used the words Ἰωάννης...ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνῃρέθη or the like[7].' Yet more decidedly: 'Until some valid reason is advanced...why this doubly attested statement of the martyrdom of James and John may not have stood on the pages of Papias...it must be accepted as the simple historical fact, in perfect harmony with the "prophecy" (*sc.* Mk x, 39) it was adduced to confirm[8].' And such positive assertions as the following are on the increase: 'henceforth there is no room for doubt that Papias did actually state that the Apostle John was slain by Jews[9].'

[1] De Boor, *TU*, ii, p. 170. In the Greek: Παπίας ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ λέγει ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ θεολόγος καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἀνῃρέθησαν. Papias, of course, could not have made use of the term ὁ θεολόγος. Cf. Jülicher, *op. cit.* p. 367.

[2] Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernat. Religion*, pp. 211 ff.

[3] J. Armitage Robinson, *Histor. Character of Fourth Gospel*, p. 79.

[4] A. V. Green, *Ephes. Canonical Writings*, p. 23.

[5] Zahn, Introd. iii, p. 206. Otherwise Gutjahr (*Glaubwürdigkeit*, p. 110) who, identifying John of Asia with the Apostle, makes the following admission: 'What reader, finding James and John in this conjunction, would ever have thought that the Baptist was meant, would not at once have thought of the son of Zebedee?'

[6] Sanday, *Criticism of Fourth Gospel*, p. 103.

[7] Swete, *JTS*, xvii, p. 378; *Apoc. of St John*, p. clxxix.

[8] B. W. Bacon, *Fourth Gosp. in Research and Debate*, p. 133.

[9] De Boor, *op. cit.* ii, p. 177. To similar effect Jülicher (*op. cit.* p. 368):

A safe conclusion, perhaps, is that the case for the statement attributed to Papias by 'George the Monk' and Philip of Side 'seems stronger than is generally acknowledged by conservative critics[1]'; nor is it surprising that it be said: 'what must be explained is its (*sc.* the statement) displacement by the subsequently dominant tradition of the survival of John[2].' Of course Papias may have blundered. The assumption being that what he is held to have affirmed is fact, how is the silence of Eusebius and others respecting such a fact to be accounted for? A reminder comes that[3] ecclesiastical historians have the knack of suppression, and it may have point here.

But the case for the alleged statement gains in strength as certain notices and allusions, met with elsewhere, are taken into consideration.

i. To turn first to Clement of Alexandria. In the passage in question[4] he appeals to Holy Scripture in its demands to risk martyrdom sooner than deny Christ; he proceeds to quote Heracleon[5] who, says he, affirms that there are two ways of making confession; he then instances Heracleon's allusion to some who had not sealed their faith with their lives: *ἐξ ὧν Ματθαῖος, Φίλιππος, Θωμᾶς, Λευὶς καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί.*

The distinction between Matthew and Levi, met with now and again elsewhere, is of no great moment. The one point to fasten on is the explicit denial of 'red martyrdom' in a context from which the name of the Apostle John is absent—he is surely not relegated to the 'many others.' Clement, it would appear, makes no demur.

Is there much force in the suggestion that, if the Apostle's

Schwartz (*Über den Tod der Söhne Zeb., passim*); Schmiedel (*Evang. Briefe u. Offenbarung Joh.* p. 7); Heitmüller (*SNT*, ii, p. 710); Wellhausen (*Das Evang. Joh.* pp. 119 ff.).

[1] Scott-Moncrieff, *St John Apostle, Evangelist and Prophet*, p. 252.

[2] B. W. Bacon, *op. cit.* p. 133.

[3] Bolingbroke, also Bousset. Eusebius, who has no very high opinion of Papias, may have classed the statement along with other *μυθικώτερα* (*HE*, iii, 39).

[4] *Strom.* iv, 9.

[5] See Brooke, *Extant Fragments of Heracleon, TS*, I, iv, p. 102.

name is absent, sufficient explanation is forthcoming in stories already current as to the Patmos-exile and the caldron of boiling oil?

ii. We pass on to the apocryphal Martyrdom of Andrew[1]. Here a tale is told of the Apostles meeting in conclave at Jerusalem: 'Wherefore do we delay,' asks Peter, 'to enter upon our work?' In the event lots are cast, and respective mission-fields are assigned to each and all: *καὶ ἐκληρώθη Πέτρος τὴν περιτομήν· Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης τὴν ἀνατολήν· Φίλιππος τὰς πόλεις τῆς Σαμαρίας καὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν....*

No doubt pure legend. It will be observed that, as by Polycrates[2], so here, Philip the Evangelist is confounded with the Apostle of the same name. The point is that the words *τὴν ἀνατολήν* are in the very teeth of the tradition as to a departure to and prolonged residence in Asia Minor in the case of the Apostle John.

iii. Next comes the Syriac Martyrology[3]. Dated A.D. 411 and drawn up at Edessa for the use of the local church, it is based on an 'Ur-Martyrolog' which Duchesne locates at Nicomedia. It contains the following commemorations:

Dec. 27. *Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἰάκωβος οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις.*
Dec. 28. *Ἐν Ῥώμῃ τῇ πόλει Παῦλος καὶ Συμεὼν Κηφᾶς ὁ κορυφαῖος τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν.*

Here, as elsewhere, is encountered the popular tradition of a Church—Edessa; also Nicomedia—in regard to martyrs. The tradition is well founded in the case of Paul, and probably of Peter; in respect of James it is confirmed by Acts xii, 2. Is there ground for questioning its validity in the case of John the brother of James?

It would by no means necessarily follow that, because thus

[1] Bonnet, *Acta Apos. Apocr.* II, i, pp. 46 ff. Scholten (*Der Apos. Joh. in Kleinasien*, p. 82) speaks of a new feature introduced by Origen in assigning John's field to Asia.

[2] Euseb. *HE*, iii, 31. Let me here disclaim responsibility for the 'as by Gaius' which occurs in my Note (*JTS*, xviii, p. 30) on the death of John, son of Zebedee. The words 'as by Polycrates' stood in the proof revised by me.

[3] *Die drei ältesten Martyrologien* (Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte*), pp. 8 ff.

linked together in the Martyrology, the two brothers suffered at the same place and date[1].

iv. The last witness to be called is Aphrahat[2]. In his homily *De Persecutione* (dated A.D. 343 or 344) the 'Persian Sage' speaks thus:

> "Great and excellent is the martyrdom of Jesus...to him followed the faithful martyr Stephen whom the Jews stoned. Simon also and Paul were perfect martyrs. James and John trod in the footsteps of their Master Christ. Also other of the Apostles thereafter in divers places confessed, and proved themselves true martyrs."

The James and John here named are, beyond doubt, the two sons of Zebedee. Inasmuch as Aphrahat, far from confining himself to those who had actually yielded up their lives, makes room for others who had endured suffering, the question might arise whether—in an allusion which, possibly, is 'etwas vag[3]'—John, by reason of stories which had gathered round his name, be not here simply accorded martyr-rank. Yet the context surely points the other way; and besides, the closing words of the passage cited are such as to invite the conjecture that the Apostle died, by actual martyrdom, a relatively early death.

Of such sort are the four notices and allusions[4]. Weighed in the balances of critical investigation they might severally invite suspicion; they are of unequal value; the third and the fourth are perhaps more deserving of credence than the remaining two[5]. But their cumulative effect is strong. Grave doubt is awakened by them as to the traditional Ephesian residence, the peaceful death in extreme old age, of the Apostle John. They account, it may be, for the otherwise incomprehensible attitude of Ignatius; who, address-

[1] Achelis, *Die Martyrologien*, pp. 27, 58 ff. Cf. Burkitt, *Gospel Hist. and its Transmission*, pp. 253 ff.

[2] Bishop of the Monastery of Mar Mathai, Metropolitan of Nineveh. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, xii, pp. 2, 158, 401; *TU*, iii, pp. 329 ff.

[3] Erbes, *ZKG*, xxxiii, ii, p. 203.

[4] For some further discussion of them (adverse or otherwise), see *int. al.*, J. Armitage Robinson, *op. cit.* pp. 64 ff.; J. H. Bernard, *Irish Church Quarterly* for Jan. 1908; Clemen, *Entstehung des Johannes Evglm.* pp. 442 ff.; Moffat, *Intr. NT*, pp. 608 ff.; Bousset, *TR*, 1905, pp. 225 ff.

[5] 'The evidence of Heracleon should never have been brought forward,' A. E. Brooke, *DAC*, i, p. 626.

ing himself to the Ephesian Christians, is content to refer to Paul while he finds not a single word to say of one whose hallowed memory would—had he actually resided among them—be peculiarly dear to their hearts[1]. And they incite to search for some explicit statement that John son of Zebedee did really and truly die a martyr's death.

The statement is to hand; in the words which, attributed by two authorities to Papias, are precisely what the recorded Saying of Jesus to the brother-pair has prepared the seeker to expect.

It has been hinted that the historicity of the incident narrated Mk x, 35–40 = Mt. xx, 20–23 does not pass unchallenged[2]. The section is without a Lucan parallel[3]; was it absent from the Mk used by Luke? if not so absent, did Luke deliberately suppress it by reason of a still living son of Zebedee, or simply decide to pass over the whole episode (Mk x, 35–45) while transferring the Lord's words on the subject of humility to the account (Lk. xxii, 24–27) of what happened at the Last Supper[4]? The latter alternative is preferable. Let it then be frankly conceded that the story as told by Mk (and condensed by Mt.), far from being the *verbatim* report of a stenographer, is the embroidered product of a day long subsequent to the period to which it points. The main fact to be reckoned with is that the recorded prediction to the brother-pair is allowed to stand part of it. Would this have been the case had the prediction been altogether unfulfilled, or only half-fulfilled, when the story went its round[5]?

On the assumption, scarcely gratuitous, that John son of Zebedee met a violent end, a two-fold question is suggested: when and where did he suffer? Tentative answers must suffice.

When? It has been suggested that the words 'whom Herod

[1] Loisy, *Quatrième Évan.* p. 6.

[2] See on this point Montefiore, *Syn. Gospels*, i, pp. 257 f.; also *SNT*, i, p. 173 f.

[3] Bacon (*op. cit.* p. 449) writes: 'for which Lk. xxii, 30 significantly substitutes the *logion* Mt. xix, 28.'

[4] Stanton, *op. cit.* ii, p. 162.

[5] Decided answers in the negative come from Wellhausen (*Evang. Marci*, p. 90); Heitmüller (*SNT*, ii, p. 710); Forbes, *op. cit.* p. 166. Yet similar objection might be raised in the case of the 'unfulfilled prediction,' Mt. x, 23.

killed[1]' refer to both the sons of Zebedee; the suggestion is not easily reconciled with the text of Acts xii, 2, nor yet with the vague allusion to Papias—which seems to point from Herod Agrippa I to 'Jews who could not further be specified[2].' If the John of Gal. ii, 9 be indeed the Apostle John (and he surely is)[3], the date of Paul's conference with the 'pillar-apostles' becomes the *terminus a quo*; unless John does actually reappear at Ephesus, which is unlikely, the year of the Fall of Jerusalem might be taken as *terminus ad quem*; and this might be pushed somewhat further back if the Marcan Gospel falls within the period 'after A.D. 64 but not much after A.D. 70[4],' and it be allowed that the prediction of Jesus was already an accomplished fact.

To turn to the question of locality. It being allowed, for the moment, that John did actually make his way to Ephesus[5], was his martyr-death instigated by 'Jews' of Asia Minor as happened in the case of Polycarp? The conjecture is precarious[6]; and besides, tradition knows nothing whatsoever of a martyred John of Asia. If the Apostle 'fell a victim to Jewish hate, it was only in Palestine that such a fate could have befallen him[7]'; once more, then, pointed to 'the East' (as by the Martyrdom of Andrew), the allusion Gal. ii, 9 is again significant; it suggests that John, extending the right hand of fellowship to Paul and Barnabas, decides to cast in his lot with 'the circumcision'; when the curtain then and there falls on him it is without hint that he will one day bid farewell to a Palestinian home. An appeal, perhaps, lies to the Muratorian fragment; John 'seems to be thought of as still living at Jerusalem[8].' Was it there that, following in his Master's steps

[1] See Achalis (*op. cit.* pp. 21 ff.) on the reading *quem Herodes occidit* in the *Martyr. Karthaginiense.* [2] *EB*, ii, col. 2510.

[3] Schwartz (*op. cit.* p. 5) identifies him with John Mark. Lützelberger (*op. cit.* pp. 180, 197) is able to satisfy himself that John's death was prior to A.D. 60 on the ground that, as he puts it, Paul uses the past tense in his allusion to the 'pillars.' [4] *SNT*, i, p. 67.

[5] As maintained by, *int. al.*, Clemen, *op. cit.* p. 456; Polidori, *I Quattro Evangelii*, p. 240.

[6] See on this point Stanton, *op. cit.* i, p. 167; Pfleiderer, *Prim. Christianity*, i, pp. 128, 135; Schmiedel, *op. cit.* p. 8; Adeney, *Thess.* (*CB*), p. 10.

[7] Jülicher, *op. cit.* p. 367.

[8] *EB*, ii, col. 2511; Jülicher, *op. cit.* p. 363.

(as Aphrahat relates), he gained the crown of martyrdom? Or must the scene be transferred to Samaria, the date to the year A.D. 66? So it has recently been contended; with the suggestion that the tomb still shown at Sebaste as that of Nabi Jahja is in reality that of the Apostle John[1].

In fine. If, on the one hand, the venerable tradition to the effect that John son of Zebedee lived to be an old man and went down to his grave in peace has support behind it, so, on the other hand, it is plain that, in the fourth century, both in Asia Minor and in the farther East, a tradition persisted that he had actually died a martyr's death. To speak, then, of 'the universal tradition of the Church[2]' is no longer possible, and it becomes less and less easy to dismiss as 'altogether untrustworthy[3]' the story of the 'Red martyrdom' of the Apostle John[4].

[1] By Erbes, *op. cit.*

[2] J. Armitage Robinson, *op. cit.* p. 79.

[3] J. H. Bernard, *op. cit.* p. 52. See on the whole question A. E. Brooke, *DAC*, i, pp. 626 f.

[4] Scholten (*Der Apos. Joh. in Kleinasien*, pp. 127 ff.), refusing to build on the alleged statement of Papias or the fragment of Heracleon, set aside the Ephesian residence of the Apostle on independent grounds.

EXCURSUS II

THE BELOVED DISCIPLE

May the veil be lifted which hides the identity of that mysterious personage whose style and title is: 'the Disciple whom Jesus loved'? Is he a real man of flesh and blood? If such he be, is he to be discovered in John son of Zebedee? If other than the Apostle John, who is he? That beautiful designation, was it self-bestowed, or did others confer it on him? So far as the New Testament is concerned, it is in our Gospel only that he is brought on the scene; for, apart from a conjecture of which more hereafter, no such personage is met with in the earlier Gospels. And again; but for the Synoptists, it would be impossible to identify the sons of Zebedee as such; for, once and once only definitely alluded to in the Fourth Gospel, it is without specification of their number or their names[1].

It will be convenient to have before us the references to the Beloved Disciple as they occur in our Gospel.

Jn xiii. 23 ff. The scene is at The Supper; by reason of the words of Jesus: 'One of you shall betray me,' the disciples are in doubt; it is then said: 'There was at the table reclining in Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom (ὅν) Jesus loved. Simon Peter therefore beckoneth to him, and saith unto him, Tell us of whom he speaketh. He leaning back, as he was, on Jesus' breast saith unto him, Lord, who is it?'

The manner of the representation is such as to suggest a person who, peculiarly dear to Jesus, is held by others to be in the inmost confidences of their Lord.

Jn xviii. 15 ff. The Trial has begun: Simon Peter, it is said, 'followed Jesus, and *so did* another disciple. Now that disciple

[1] Jn xxi. 2: καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου. 'Dass der Lieblingsjünger gerade ein Zebedaide sei, ist mit nichts angedeutet,' Alex. Schweizer, *op. cit.* p. 235. The allusions to James and John in Acts are simply decisive for a brother-pair; who their father was is not told.

was known unto the high priest, and entered in with Jesus into the court of the high priest: but Peter was standing at the door without. So the other disciple, which was known unto the high priest, went out and spake unto her that kept the door, and brought in Peter.' The question then is whether he thus vaguely designated (ἄλλος μαθητής, ὁ δὲ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος, ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ ἄλλος) be really the Disciple whom Jesus loved or another person.

We remark a conflict of opinion. It is hesitatingly said that perhaps he is[1]; the suggestion of an omission or dislocation of the text is ventured[2]; a halting verdict, adducing the view of a majority of Fathers (viz. that the person really is the Beloved Disciple) adds that 'perhaps they are right[3]'; of proof, it is said, there is none: 'the inference is simply suggested to the reader's mind in view of Mk xiv. 33[4]'; if it be admitted that the idea that this disciple is the Beloved Disciple has prevailed in the end, and that at the least it is probable[5], it is with no decisive word; quite recently it has been argued that the unnamed disciple of the section is none other than Judas Iscariot who lures Peter to his fall[6]; conjecture has pointed to one of the nobility of Jerusalem[7]. On the other hand he is more or less boldly identified with the son of Zebedee; 'in all probability John himself[8]'; 'the reader cannot fail to identify the disciple with St John[9].' Be he so identified or not, the prevalent view regards him as the Disciple whom Jesus loved—whoever that disciple may be.

The problem, for such it is, is encompassed with difficulty. Yet the prevalent view has strong support behind it; not only is

[1] 'Der andere Jünger dürfte der Jünger sein, den Jesus liebte,' Heitmüller, *SNT*, ii, p. 844.

[2] 'Es scheint hier etwas zu fehlen oder in Unordnung zu sein,' Wellhausen, *Evang. Joh.* p. 82 note.

[3] Bauer, *Handbuch zum NT*, II, ii, pp. 130, 162. In the view of Augustine (tr. cxiii) the question does not admit of hasty decision, yet he leans to the identification. Cf. Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 833.

[4] Bacon, *op. cit.* p. 307.

[5] Loisy, *op. cit.* p. 833. 'Très vraisemblablement,' Réville, *op. cit.* p. 312.

[6] E. A. Abbott, *Fourfold Gospel*, sect. ii ('The Beginning'), pp. 351 f. The same view was put forward, at a far earlier day, by Caspar Merken and Heumann.

[7] See Lampe, *Commen. in Evang. Joh.* iii, p. 522.

[8] McClymont, *St John* (*CB*), p. 313.

[9] Westcott, *St John* (*in loc.*), and cf. Hastings, *DB*, ii, p. 781.

the coupling here, as elsewhere, with Peter suggestive, but there is another point which perhaps deserves notice: with but one exception, it is only when in the actual company of Jesus that the nameless disciple is expressly alluded to as the Beloved Disciple, while in the section now in hand the situation is altogether different. And besides, the term ἄλλος μαθητής is again met with Jn xx, 2, 3, 4, 8.

Let us assume that the Beloved Disciple is really meant. In that case he is evidently a personage of rank and distinction[1].

Jn xix, 25 ff. Here the Beloved Disciple is standing at the Cross of Jesus. The Mother of Jesus is entrusted to his charge; and, to all appearance, he takes action without delay: 'from that hour the disciple took her unto his own *home*.' Quite in the manner of the Fourth Evangelist no word is said of his return to Calvary; yet it is safe perhaps to discover him in the *crux* of commentators: 'he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true: and he (ἐκεῖνος, some third person) knoweth that he saith true, that ye also may believe.'

The inference surely is that he who, having taken Mary to his own home[2] (εἰς τὰ ἴδια), is quickly back at the Cross, is resident in, or in the vicinity of, Jerusalem.

Jn xx, 2 ff. The scene is now laid at the Grave of Jesus. Upon tidings brought by Mary Magdalene 'to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved,' they both ran to the tomb; of the 'other disciple' it is said that he 'outran Peter,' and, first to arrive, looks in yet does not enter; Peter, following, enters the tomb forthwith: 'then entered in therefore the other disciple also, which came first to the tomb, and he saw and believed.'

An impression is conveyed, that, as contrasted with Peter, the 'other disciple' (who is the Beloved Disciple) has all the vigour of youth or early manhood.

Jn xxi, 1-24 (The appendix chapter). Here the story tells of

[1] See *infra*, p. 162, Note 5.

[2] It must be remembered that the Mother of Jesus may here be an ideal figure representing Judaism and the Beloved Disciple typical of the Christian Church. And thus Kreyenbühl (*op. cit.* ii. p. 599), 'auch das *stabat mater* macht wohl dem Herzen seines Dichters Ehre, hat aber leider in der Geschichte keinen Grund.'

a manifestation of the Risen Lord. Whether one of 'the *sons* of Zebedee,' one of the 'two other of his disciples,' or some other person, the Beloved Disciple looms large on the scene. He it is who, recognizing Jesus, says to Peter: 'It is the Lord.' To him Peter points with the question: 'Lord, and what shall this man do?' The reply of Jesus misunderstood, the saying goes abroad: 'that that disciple should not die'; the misunderstanding is then corrected. Once more the same individual is pointed to: 'This is the disciple which beareth witness of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his witness is true.'

It shall suffice to say here that the allusions are of such a nature as to imply the, perhaps recent, death of the Beloved Disciple.

Returning to the questions proposed at the outset, they shall be discussed under three heads.

I. Is the beloved disciple a real man of flesh and blood? Negative or hesitating answers come:—it is said that he who is thus beautifully designated (whether by himself or others) is not a historical personage, but the 'exquisite creation of a devout imagination[1].' And again, he is a type of the perfect Gnostic, spiritual witness to Jesus[2]. We are told further that there are features which are highly suggestive of an ideal figure which owes its existence to the Evangelist[3]; that of all the *dramatis personae* in our Gospel not one is so phantasmal as the Beloved Disciple himself, albeit he is something more than a purely ideal figure, for a real man has sat for the portrait[4]. As might be expected, opinions are both numerous and weighty on the other side, where there is no hesitation in believing that a real historical personage is indicated[5]. And there is certainly force in the contention that, whoever the persons may be who speak xxi, 24 and whatever the value of their

[1] *EB*, iii, col. 3339.

[2] Loisy, *op. cit.* pp. 124 ff., 'Les passages de l'Évangile où l'on croit retrouver le disciple, et ceux où il est explicitement désigné, sont loin de prouver l'historicité de son personnage et son identité avec l'apôtre Jean.' And see Scholten, *Het Evan. naar Joh.* pp. 405 ff., 'den geestelijken broeder van Jezus.' Elsewhere (*Der Apos. Joh.* p. 110), Scholten says that the Disciple stands before us like another Melchizedek, ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος.

[3] Heitmüller, *SNT*, ii, pp. 714 ff. [4] Bacon, *op. cit.* pp. 319 ff., 325.

[5] As a rule the further step is taken of identifying the Beloved Disciple with the Apostle John.

testimony on the point of authorship, it would be almost, if not altogether, incredible that they should be victims of a delusion and not be alluding to one who (whatever his identity)[1] had actually lived a real life. Yet the case is not proved to demonstration; and perchance we must regard the Beloved Disciple 'either as a purely ideal figure or as the symbolical counterpart of a real personage[2].'

We will content ourselves with saying that, on the one hand, it is not inconceivable that the portrait is, if somewhat highly coloured, of a real man, while, on the other hand, it is quite possible that it is of an ideal disciple.

II. Let it be assumed for the sake of the argument that the Beloved Disciple is a real man. We then ask: is he verily and indeed the son of Zebedee? It is, of course, held by many that he is; yet adverse voices are raised, there are not a few who are convinced that he is not. In the latter case it is nevertheless allowed by some that the identification has been drawn already, if wrongly, by the anonymous persons who, xxi, 24, testify to the authorship of our Gospel.

The question demands lengthy inquiry; and with necessary reference to the 'venerable tradition' which brings the Apostle John to Ephesus.

Now, what is recorded in the New Testament of the Apostle John?

With good reason is it urged that a fertile cause of misconception is the habit, inveterate with many, of reading the Gospels (or hearing them read) as a single work; of preaching or teaching which, reckless of distinctive features necessitating a division into groups, is based on a combination of the several narratives[3]. A result in the case in hand is that biographies are offered of the

[1] 'L'identification du disciple bien-aimé avec l'apôtre Jean n'est pas le fait de l'auteur de xxi,' Réville, *op. cit.* p. 312.

[2] E. F. Scott, *op. cit.* p. 47. In the latter alternative Scott fastens on Paul. Réville (*op. cit.* p. 317) says of the Beloved Disciple: 'Il apparait comme un être irréel... le disciple idéal qui est sur le sein du Christ, comme le Christ est sur le sein de Dieu.'

[3] 'In einer unnatürlichen Einheit,' Baur, *Kanon. Evang.* p. 63. Cf. Wernle, *Die Quellen*, p. 15.

Apostle John which, all four Gospels being fused together into a single whole, depend for outline, perhaps, on the Synoptics while the lights and shades are filled in from the Fourth Gospel. Its author is boldly identified with the Beloved Disciple and the Beloved Disciple with the son of Zebedee. His circumstances, his character, are then glibly delineated in terms of writings which bear the Apostle John's name[1].

In the present instance, any such unwarrantable method being definitely repudiated, resort shall be had at the outset to the Synoptic Gospels. It is said of the two brothers James and John that they respond to the definite call of Jesus[2]. Of their father Zebedee no more is known than that he was a Galilaean fisherman with hired servants in his employ[3]; as for their mother it is probably safe to identify her with Salome[4], and, if so, she is sister to the Mother of Jesus, cousin of Elizabeth, and one of the women who minister to Jesus of their substance and bring sweet spices to the tomb. They, James and John, are in partnership with Peter[5]. They are present at the healing of Peter's mother-in-law[6]. Ordained of the number of the Twelve, they are surnamed Boanerges[7]; a designation of obscure significance, but interpreted of fiery zeal, which is not again applied to them. An ambitious request is made by them[8];—according to another version of the story their mother makes it on their behalf[9]—and they learn their destined fate. Alike they are ready to call down fire from heaven on inhospitable Samaritans[10], if it be John only who reports to Jesus how he and the other disciples had dealt with one who, not a follower with them, was casting out devils[11]. Together with James and Peter he

[1] As e.g. by Macdonald, *Life and Writings of St John*; Polidori, *I Quattro Evangelii*, pp. 26 ff.; Hastings, *DB*, ii, pp. 680 ff.; Johnston, *Philosophy of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 17 f.; Hitchcock, *A Fresh Study of the Fourth Gospel*.

[2] Mk i, 19. [3] Mk i, 20.

[4] Cf. Mt. xxvii, 56; Mk xvi, 1. [5] Lk. v, 7, 10. [6] Mk i, 29–31, pars.

[7] Mk iii, 17. With allusion to the Hermetic literature it is suggested that the word, compounded of *βοάω* and *ἐνέργεια*, may mean sons, or manifestations, of the Divine voice.

[8] Mk x, 35 ff. [9] Matt. xx, 20. [10] Lk. ix, 54.

[11] Mk ix, 38; Lk. ix, 49. Is it strictly accurate to say that he 'plays no independent part or special rôle in the Synoptic tradition'? Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 565.

is included in a sort of inner circle within the 'Apostolic College'; he is present at the raising of Jairus' daughter[1]; he is a witness of the Transfiguration[2]; he is one of those who ask when events predicted are to come to pass[3]. But once is he found in the sole company of Peter—when sent by Jesus to prepare the Paschal meal[4]. Present, so it may be inferred, at the Last Supper, he is certainly in the Garden of Gethsemane[5]. Nowhere is he again alluded to by name in the Synoptic Narrative.

To pass from the Synoptics to Acts. John's name stands third ('Peter and James and John') on the list of the Eleven who are assembled, with others, in the Upper Room[6]. With Peter, who takes the lead, he is at the Gate Beautiful when the lame man is made to walk[7]. With Peter he is imprisoned and brought before the Sanhedrin: while Peter is spokesman, there is equal 'boldness' on the part of John, the two are equally accounted 'unlearned and ignorant men[8].' With Peter he goes from Jerusalem to Samaria on a mission of inspection[9]. When next alluded to by name, and for the last time, it is simply in connexion with his brother's martyrdom; Herod 'killed James the brother of John with the sword[10].'

To turn from Acts to the Epistle to the Galatians. According to Paul's statement, James (the 'Lord's brother'), Cephas (Peter) and John (surely the Apostle John), 'the three leading apostles,' are in repute as 'Pillars' of the Jerusalem Church[11]. Whether John be of the stricter school of James or of the less conservative school of Peter there is little if anything to determine; his belief, it seems, is that his own mission field is circumscribed. He allows that to Paul and Barnabas a divine call has come to labour among the gentiles, and he extends to them the right hand of fellowship. As for himself, it would appear that he is content to stay on where he is, and to devote all his energies to 'the circumcision[12].'

[1] Mk v, 37, pars. [2] Mk ix, 2, pars. [3] Mk xiii, 3.
[4] Lk. xxii, 8. [5] Mk xiv, 33; Matt. xxvi, 36.
[6] Acts i, 13. [7] Acts iii, 1 ff. [8] Acts iv, 1, 3, 8, 13.
[9] Acts viii, 14. 'Eine Art Kontrolle,' von Dobschütz, *Das Apos. Zeitalter*, p. 39. [10] Acts xii, 2.
[11] Gal. ii, 9. Schwartz's contention that the John of Paul's allusion was 'John whose surname was Mark' has been noted elsewhere.
[12] Gal. ii, 9. See Scholten, *Het Evan. naar Joh.* p. 410.

And so the curtain falls on the son of Zebedee. Except on the venturesome assumption that the Apocalypse was penned by him, his name never again occurs in the pages of the New Testament. Of direct New Testament information respecting him there being, then, no further word, it shall now be asked: how does the case stand with the personality of the Apostle John as revealed in the sparse and fragmentary notices which have been instanced?

He is a Galilaean fisherman. In all probability younger than his brother James, he comes of a family which, if prosperous, is of the like stratum of society as that of Peter; if his mother be Salome he is kin to Jesus, with connexions in the priestly caste[2]. His home by the Sea of Galilee, he has at least received the education provided by the Synagogue schools of the locality[3], while, in view of the circumstances, he can doubtless make himself sufficiently understood in Greek[4]. He throws in his lot with Jesus, and is included in the number of 'the Twelve'; zealous for his Master's cause and honour, his good qualities have been marked by the penetrating gaze of Jesus[5], and his admission to the 'inner circle' tells of high regard which he had gained. Yet grave faults and defects of character are discerned in him; scarcely loveable by nature, he is impetuous and intolerant, not to say vindictive; his ambitions are self-centred, he fails to rise to spiritual conceptions[6]; if importance be attachable to order of sequence, there is

[1] 'We fail to realise how seldom St John the son of Zebedee appears in the Synoptists,' von Soden, *Early Christ. Literature*, p. 433.

[2] Cf. Lk. i, 5, 36. According to Chrysostom (*In Joan. Hom.* i) the family was wretchedly poor.

[3] For some notice of the opportunities within the reach of Galilaean boys, see J. B. Mayor, *Ep. of James*, pp. xli ff. When it is said of Peter and John that they were 'unlearned and ignorant men' the phrase simply means that they were not trained theologians by profession. Cf. Delff, *Rabbi Jesus*, p. 76. The twelfth century Byzantine monk Euthymius Zigabenus (see Ammon, *op. cit.* i, p. 76), with a view to accentuating John's later marvellous theological attainment, makes out that he had been an ignoramus (παντελῶς ἰδιώτης ἦν) in the full sense of the word.

[4] There was a considerable Greek-speaking element in the population of Galilee. Cf. Schlatter, *Die Sprache und Heimat des 4 Evglms.*

[5] Cf. Reuss, *Geschichte der HS des NT*, p. 215, 'Jesus muss tiefer geblickt haben, etc.'

[6] Joh. Weiss commenting (*SNT*, i, p. 172) on Mk x, 35, finds the story

significance in the fact that, as a rule[1], he is named last among those who form the 'inner circle' or who are 'pillars' in repute. He is not only associated with but paired with Peter; the latter being, by comparison, the man of speech and action. A leading personage in the Church at Jerusalem, he, by this time surely getting on in years[2], can indeed join in bidding Paul God-speed[3], but he himself is plainly representative of Judaistic Christendom. He thereupon vanishes from the scene; what if it be really true that he reappears at Ephesus? In that case much, let it be conceded, may have happened with the lapse of time; as with many another, so, perhaps, with John. Self-discipline may have eradicated earlier faults and feelings; his character will have been refined and sweetened; an impending catastrophe may have startled him to reflexion; Pauline influences, it might be said, have told on him, and by consequence, there are larger sympathies and a broader mind[4]. A new career, in short, may open out for him when, as the 'venerable tradition' has it, he says a last farewell to Jerusalem[5]—the Holy City soon to be, or already, encompassed by the Roman legions. He may have left his past behind him when he set foot in Asia Minor; and then the change of scene may issue in the altered man. Years go by, and higher qualities and faculties might be developed in him which, perhaps already latent, had not as yet been recognized by others or so much as suspected by himself. In the event it might come about that he is had in memory as verily and indeed the Beloved Disciple and reputed author of the Gospel which bears John's name[6].

reminiscent of some unpopularity which attached to the memory of the sons of Zebedee.

[1] There are remarkable exceptions, cf. Lk. ix, 28; Acts xii, 2.

[2] The inference is that both John and James had reached full manhood when they responded to the call of Jesus, while the date of Paul's visit to Jerusalem was some twenty years and more subsequent to the Crucifixion.

[3] Yet Wrede (*Paulus*, p. 43) remarks: 'Über ein Schiedlich-friedlich kam es doch nicht hinaus. Die Einigung bedeutete zugleich Trennung.'

[4] 'Konnte er nicht von Paulus lernen und ihn noch überschreiten?', De Wette, *op. cit.* ii, p. 233.

[5] Upholders of the 'venerable tradition' (as e.g. Polidori, *op. cit.* p. 240) are at a loss to fix a date for John's alleged departure from Judaea and arrival in Asia Minor.

[6] 'Das der Johannes der Gal. ii auftritt das Evglm. nicht geschrieben,

It must nevertheless be admitted that the Johannine portrait of the Beloved Disciple has but few features in common with that of the Synoptic John. But further inquiry is necessitated; and the question now is: What is related of him who, surviving to extreme old age at Ephesus, is in course of time positively identified with John son of Zebedee? The New Testament being silent, the region of 'somewhat fragmentary tradition[1]' must be explored.

As a group of stories run, he knows what it is to suffer persecution. The scene laid before the Latin Gate at Rome, he emerges, uninjured, from the caldron of boiling oil into which he has been plunged by cruel men[2]. He drinks of the fatal hemlock-cup, but the poison leaves him unharmed. Condemned to exile, he is banished to the Isle of Patmos; returning thence to Asia, he is ruler of the churches[3]. Other stories are connected with his asserted long residence at Ephesus. He seeks out, and reclaims, the robber-youth[4]; Cerinthus discovered by him in the public baths, he forthwith rushes out, and bids others likewise flee lest the bath fall in upon that enemy of the truth[5]. It is said that he had worn the high-priestly 'petalon[6],' and that he had brought back the dead to life[7]. To the huntsman astonished by finding him playing with his tame partridge his long since proverbial reply is that the 'bow cannot always be bent[8]'; when the Ephesian elders ask him to pen his Gospel he, by sudden inspiration, gives utterance to its opening words[9]. He sets forth what has been beautifully called 'his last will and testament[10]' with that reiterated 'Little Children, love one an-

kann unbedenklich zugegeben werden. Aber muss er derselbe geblieben sein...?' Reuss, *op. cit.* p. 215. Scholten (*op. cit.* p. 410), raising similar questions, adds significantly: 'Op zich zelf ware dit mogelijk, maar is dit ook waarschijnlijk?'

[1] Hastings, *DB*, ii, p. 681.

[2] Tertullian. In the calendar, May 6th: *St* John E. *ante Port. Lat.* According to Jerome he emerged *nihil passus; purior et vegetior exiverit quam intraverit.*

[3] Euseb. *HE*, iii, 18, 23.

[4] *Ibid.* iii, 23.

[5] Irenaeus. Euseb. iii, 28, iv, 14.

[6] Euseb. *HE*, iii, 31.

[7] *Ibid.* v, 18. Cf. Traub, *Die Wunder im NT*, pp. 45 f. Schwegler (*op. cit.* p. 155) suggests the spiritual death and resurrection of the robber youth.

[8] Cassianus. For a fable near akin to the story see Herodotus, ii, 173.

[9] Jerome, *De vir. illustr.*

[10] Lessing (*Das Testament Johannis*) says that not the prologue to the Gospel, but the touching words of John are worthy to be set up in letters of gold where they may be read of all men.

other' which wearies his hearers, who are then reminded by him that it was the Lord's command[1]. He is said to be ever virgin[2]. Death has no power over him; in his grave he goes on sleeping; a strange movement of the ground caused by the sleeper's breathing is witnessed by visitors to his tomb[3].

It may occur to some that such 'fragmentary tradition' is very near akin to if it be not altogether sheer fiction. The admission must, of course, be made that for some of the stories there is but slight authority, while it has been rightly affirmed of others that 'they are alien not only to the simplicity of Apostolic times, but to the reasonableness of Christianity itself[4].' It does not follow that they are one and all the mere creations of pious credulity; and very likely they now and again point to actual event or incident in the life of some real personage; that real person being (as those who originally told the stories or who to-day uphold the 'venerable tradition' are alike firmly persuaded) John, Apostle and Evangelist, disciple whom Jesus loved.

The stage has now been reached for instituting a comparison between the Synoptic John son of Zebedee and the Johannine Beloved Disciple who is said to have survived to extreme old age at Ephesus. And it shall be borne in mind that the solitary allusion in the Fourth Gospel to the sons of Zebedee is without mention of their number or their names; if they are among the little company to whom Jesus manifests himself at the Sea of Tiberias, there is no single word to indicate that their relations with Jesus have been singularly close. The Fourth Evangelist apparently knows nothing of any 'inner circle,' while he is curiously reticent, and, as some think, disparaging, in his notices of 'The Twelve[5].'

To begin with, the Synoptic John is a fisherman. It by no means follows that, because the Beloved Disciple is found (Jn xxi)

[1] Jerome. *Epis. ad Gal.* [2] *Monarch. Prol.*

[3] Augustine, *Tract. in Joh.* 124.

[4] Stanley, *Sermons on the Apos. Age.*

[5] Heitmüller (*SNT*, ii, p. 714) writes: 'Offensichtlich behandelt er die kanonisch gewordenen Zwölf-apostel mit einer gewissen Geringschätzung.' According to Scholten (*Der Apos. Joh. in Kleinasien*, pp. 91 f.) he goes further than Paul and Luke in representing the inadequacy of the apostolate of the Twelve. And see W. F. Loman, *op. cit.* pp. 24 ff.

in the company of fishermen, he is therefore of the same trade himself; and besides, he may be one or other of the two unnamed disciples[1], conceivably he is an eighth person[2]. There is at least the possibility that, far from being an artisan, he is the leisured man of means.

Again. If well-to-do and with relatives among the priesthood, the family of which John is a member is in no way socially removed above that of Peter. True that the following of a trade was not only no social barrier but enjoined by Jewish custom, yet it is certainly suggestive that a term (γνωστὸς) which may imply relationship[3] with the High priest is used of the Beloved Disciple. An impression is in any case conveyed that the latter, evidently quite at home in exalted circles[4], is Peter's superior in rank[5].

Thirdly. The son of Zebedee of the Synoptics is coupled with Peter as is also the Beloved Disciple of the Fourth Gospel. Admitting that the coincidence is too striking[6] to be ignored, it is not inconceivable that there were occasions on which Peter was accompanied, not by John, but by another, and far younger, attached friend. The latter, in that case, is the Beloved Disciple; and he, to all appearance, is John's junior by many years.

Another point. John is one of 'the Twelve.' Not so, it would seem, is the Beloved Disciple.

In the fifth place. The Beloved Disciple stands by the Cross of Jesus, and is, apparently, witness of the closing scenes. Scarcely so John; the statement Mk xiv, 50 is strongly suggestive of his

[1] Godet discovers in them John the Presbyter and Aristion. Cf. Holtzmann, *Evglm. des Joh.* p. 226.

[2] Seven persons only being specified in the narrative.

[3] So Delff. The possibility is allowed by Holtzmann (*op. cit.* p. 23), and E. G. King (*Interpreter*, v, p. 170). But see E. A. Abbott, *op. cit.* p. 356; also Westcott, *St John*, p. 255. 'Connu ou parent du grand prêtre,' Calmes, *op. cit.* p. 426.

[4] The assumption here is that he is the ἄλλος μαθητής of Jn xviii, 15 ff.

[5] But cf. Sanday, *op. cit.* p. 101. Yet if there be any question of the 'servants' hall,' Peter surely has to wait there while his companion as evidently has the entrée which admits him to the presence. And see Swete, *JTS*, xvii, pp. 372 f. Thus Jerome (*Ep.* cxxvii, 5): *Unde et Jesus Johannem Evangelistam amabat plurimum: qui propter generis nobilitatem erat notus pontifici.*

[6] See Sanday's forcible remarks on this point, *op. cit.* p. 107.

absence. He might, indeed, have overcome his fears; yet even then his place would be with those who (Lk. xxiii, 49) 'stood afar off.'

Next. The conjecture is not far-fetched that the Beloved Disciple is a dweller in or near Jerusalem. There is nothing to suggest a like inference in the case of John; his fixed abode is evidently in Galilee.

A last consideration; it relates to type of character. As for the Beloved Disciple, he is slow to speak; whatever may have been the case with John at a later period, in the days when he companies with Jesus he is scarcely reluctant to give vent to his thoughts. While on both sides there are features which testify to devotion to the Lord and Master, with the one it endures to the end, and with the other it fails with the test. There are singularly unpleasant traits in John; not so with the Beloved Disciple, even if the conjectured real man was by no means the placid and effeminate personage of conventional representation. There is little difficulty in recognizing the latter when the scene is shifted from Palestine to Asia Minor; on the contrary, there are vivid reminders of him in the 'fragmentary tradition'; far less easy is it to discover in the stories told of 'John of Ephesus' the son of Zebedee. John, in days gone by, has attained to prominence at Jerusalem; it might be tempting to suppose that, president of the churches of Asia, it is the self-same John who is once again in renown. As for the Beloved Disciple, he is evidently quite at home in a Greek-speaking community; the conjecture, then, might be that he who, in earlier life, had at least a smattering of Greek has become familiar with the language as the years go by. Two of the legendary stories are, it may be, reminiscent of the 'son of thunder' of the Synoptic Narrative. There is a touch of John's impetuosity in the sharp rebuke administered to the bishop who has failed in his duty to the robber-youth; of his intolerance in the tale told of one who rushes from the public baths because of the detested presence of Cerinthus[1].

[1] If it be really the Beloved Disciple who penned the Third of the Johannine Epistles, the sharp allusion to Diotrophes (*vv.* 9, 10) might be to the point. Cf. Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Prim. Church*, pp. 221 f.

To sum up. Upon the one hand there is, no doubt, something to be said for the time-honoured belief which identifies John son of Zebedee with 'John of Ephesus.' The pairing with Peter is of significance; on both sides there is acknowledged leadership; if the one be the man of means the other is well-to-do; priestly connexions may be fairly adduced; stress may, unquestionably, be laid on intimate relations with Jesus. Yet upon the other hand there is something, and it is a larger something, which goes far to shake the belief to its foundations. There is no escape from impressions as to difference of social status. As for the Apostle John, he is brought on the field at a comparatively early date; not until a later period does the Beloved Disciple stand in full view[1]. The latter is evidently a Jerusalemite; the former is as evidently a Galilaean. The one, constant to the end, is at the Cross of Jesus; John, it would appear, is not there. And besides: 'All the depth of insight and fervour of love which we connect with the name of John belong to the Beloved Disciple and not, so far as we know, to the son of Zebedee[2].'

The conclusion here is (and it is arrived at quite independently of evidence relative to the Apostle John's early death by martyrdom) that, if a real person, the Beloved Disciple is not John brother of James and one of 'The Twelve[3].'

III. Who, then, is he, this anonymous disciple whom Jesus loved? (Truly it is difficult to see in him 'even a glorified son of Zebedee[4],' if only because the Ephesian residence of the latter is incapable of proof.) Needs must be to look in other quarters; and, as guess-work alone is possible, there is small prospect of rewarded search.

Inconceivable as it may be—conjecture has fastened on 'the man of Kerioth[5].' Not only is the Beloved Disciple identified with

[1] He has been discovered, and perhaps rightly, in the nameless disciple of Jn i, 35–40. See below.

[2] Swete, *JTS*, xvii, p. 373.

[3] As against Percy Gardner (*Ephes. Gospel*, p. 69). In any case the time has long gone by for inability to identify the Beloved Disciple with John the Apostle to be airily dismissed by reviewers (e.g. Marcus Dods, *British Weekly*, Dec. 13, 1906) as a 'modern fad.'

[4] Bacon, *op. cit.* p. 319.

[5] Noack, *Geschichte Jesus* (*Publ.* 1876).

'the traitor' of Gospel representation[1], but, with large deductions made from it, Judas Iscariot is presumed to be author of the Fourth Gospel. He and he only has entered into the Master's mind and purposes; he plays into the hands of Jesus in the deed for which tradition has vilified his name[2]. So runs the theory; but, quite apart from what to many is its offensiveness, it breaks down at two points. To begin with, in the narrative Jn xiii, 21 ff., Judas and the Beloved Disciple are plainly two distinct personages. And again, the latter is not a member of the 'Apostolic College'; the former is certainly an Apostle, and, it may be, 'the first or the chief of the Twelve[3].'

With far greater attractiveness does conjecture fix on the person alluded to in the recorded Saying (Jn i, 47): 'Behold, an Israelite indeed in whom is no guile[4].' Views have, no doubt, been entertained that the portrait is really that of Paul[5]; it might readily be allowed that, were the Fourth Gospel alone available as guide, the choice would soonest fall on the Nathaniel[6] who, introduced by Philip to Jesus, reappears with others (Jn xxi, 2) at the Sea of Tiberias. He is quite the type of person to be dear to the Master's heart; is he, then, the man we are seeking? There is this difficulty; the latter is a Jerusalemite, Nathaniel is 'of Cana in Galilee.'

Interesting in any case is the suggestion which, not content with bare admissions of a contingency[7], bids seekers turn with confidence to the family at Bethany. 'Some of the conditions are,' no doubt, 'satisfied by Lazarus'; according to the Fourth Gospel representa-

[1] The hypothesis lies behind some pages of a work by the Russian novelist Leonid N. Andréyev of which a translation has been published (*Judas Iscariot*) by W. H. Lowe.

[2] The representations of Judas constitute an enigma, and De Quincey's Essay on the subject is still much to the point.

[3] In an interesting paper (*JTS*, xviii, pp. 32 ff.), A. Wright, remarking on Mk xiv, 10—where Judas is called ὁ εἷς τῶν δώδεκα—advances the view that ὁ εἷς is Hellenistic Greek for ὁ πρῶτος.

[4] So Spaeth and Rovers. And cf. Jülicher, *op. cit.* p. 370; E. F. Scott, *op. cit.* p. 47.

[5] So Holtzmann and Hilgenfeld. Cf. Rom. ii, 28 f.

[6] Cf. Gutjahr, *Glaubwürdigkeit*, etc., p. 184.

[7] *Ibid.* 'Selbst Lazarus wäre nicht ausgeschlossen.'

tion he might be regarded as a man of means (xii, 1 ff.); his home is within easy reach of Jerusalem[1]; it is emphatically stated (xi, 3, 6, 36) that Jesus loved him[2]. The coincidences are striking; nor need we wonder that, with abundant variety of detail and suggestion, it should be vigorously affirmed in two quarters[3] that he is the Beloved Disciple. Yet the question arises whether the Lazarus of the beautiful Johannine story be an actual historical personage, or, in part at all events, the creation of the Fourth Evangelist—built up, perhaps, on Synoptic references to 'a certain beggar' (Lk. xvi, 20) and (Lk. x, 38 ff.) to a sister-pair. The real personage admitted[4], it is still not easy to conceive of any chain of circumstances which would have converted Lazarus of Bethany into the θεολόγος, the leader of Greek Christianity who survived under the name of John to the end of the first century[5].

A Jew of Jerusalem the Beloved Disciple is; had he belonged to the Sadducaean party? Had he been himself a priest[6]? If so, a conjecture might be that he is the John found in the Sanhedrin (Acts iv, 5 f.) together with others 'of the kindred of the high priest.' The theme of somewhat venturesome speculation, he is discovered in the 'certain young man' Mk xiv, 51 f., who momentarily appears at the Arrest[7]. Another suggestion (it has been alluded to in ch. x) is that he is the Aristion who is coupled by Papias with 'John the Presbyter.'

Yet one more conjecture. As baldly stated[8], it amounts to this, that albeit the Synoptists know nothing of a disciple specially beloved by Jesus, they nevertheless agree in relating how there came

[1] Swete, *JTS*, xvii, p. 374.

[2] ὃν φιλεῖς, ἠγάπα δὲ ὁ Ἰησ., πῶς ἐφίλει αὐτόν. The significance of the Greek verbs is discussed further on.

[3] See a paper (*Guardian* of 19 Dec. 1906) by my friend the Rev. W. K. Fleming, B.D., who now informs me that he is possessed of additional proof. The second reference is to Zwickendraht, *Schweiz. theol. Zeitschrift*, 1915, ii, pp. 49 ff. For a rejoinder, by Steck, see *Schw. TZ*, xxxiii, 1916, pp. 91 ff. Kreyenbühl goes on to identify Lazarus with Menander.

[4] His portrait, as Eleazar, is somewhat fantastically drawn by the Russian novelist already instanced, and in the same work. Browning's poem is, of course, familiar to every reader.

[5] Swete, *JTS*, xvii, p. 374.

[6] Cf. Burkitt, *Gosp. Hist.* p. 248.

[7] Erbes, *op. cit.*

[c] By the present writer some dozen years ago.

a certain young man to him with an anxious question[1], while it is expressly recorded by one (Mk) that 'Jesus looking upon him loved him'; the suggestion thereupon follows that he who then and there made 'the great refusal' may have become ere long not the disciple only, but the devoted friend of Jesus. As elaborately worked out[2], the conjecture discovers the young man of rank and learning at an earlier period; he has come under the Baptist's influence; for one day, it may be, he has been a follower of Jesus (Jn i, 19–28); again in Peraea he, half a disciple already, is impressed greatly by the Master's act and words in the Blessing of the little children; he puts his question; he goes away sorrowful, yet, dwelling on the look of love, he is already potentially the disciple he is destined soon to be. Himself the good-man of the house (Mk xiv, 14), he welcomes the little company to a lordly room: naturally present at the Supper, his place as naturally is very near to Jesus. Ruler (Lk.) that he is, it might well follow that he is an acquaintance if not a relation of the high priest; hence the ease with which Peter is admitted by him to the presence-chamber. Like his friends Nicodemus and Joseph he is drawn nearer to Jesus in the closing scene; while others are afar off he—the young man—stands with the women at the Cross; Mary is led by him to his adjacent home; at the burial he shares, perhaps, the charitable work of embalmment with his two above-named friends. He runs with Simon Peter to the empty tomb. He figures once again in the appendix to the Gospel (Jn xxi); not the son of Zebedee, he is surely included in the phrase: 'two other of his disciples.'

The conjecture, broadly taken, is a tempting one. This, at the least, might be urged in its support; it 'answers better to the requirements of the case' than does that which points so confidently to Lazarus. And again, of the rich young man who was a ruler 'who shall say that Christ's love did not avail to bring him back? or that on his return he may not have attached himself to Jesus with a fervour and whole-heartedness which justified the Lord's immediate recognition of his worth[3]'?

[1] Mk x, 17 ff. = Mt. xix, 16 ff. = Lk. xviii, 18 ff.

[2] In an exceedingly suggestive paper by E. C. King, *Interpreter*, Jan. 1909, pp. 167 ff.

[3] Swete, *JTS*, xvii, p. 374.

Non liquet. Conjecture may follow on conjecture, but of conclusive proof there is none; perhaps no last word is possible. That he is a real person is far from certain. If real person he be he is not—so we venture to decide—the son of Zebedee. Otherwise the veil which hides the identity of 'the disciple whom Jesus loved' refuses to be drawn.

Once more proceeding on the assumption that he is not simply an ideal figure, let us ask in conclusion: is he himself, or are others, responsible for that 'phrase of blessed memory[1]' which, so it has been said, is not expressive of the devotion of the disciple but of a preference by which he was distinguished by his Lord[2]?

If he himself it be, he has certainly gone the right way to conceal his own identity. Never is the designation used by him in the first person; nowhere in the Gospel is there anything equivalent to an 'I am he'; while search is vain in tradition for hint, let alone statement, that, if alluded to as the Beloved Disciple, it was because he was so wont to allude to himself. Looking to the manner of the Johannine representation—'one of his disciples,' 'the disciple,' 'the other disciple,' 'that disciple'—the inference is not exactly far-fetched that some third person is throughout responsible for the designation.

It may be so. Assuming, if only for the moment, that he is really author of (or authority for) the Fourth Gospel, a further inference might be well founded that the Johannine sections in which he figures are coloured by a redactor's hand. The question at once arises: how had it come about that men spoke of him as the disciple beloved by Jesus? And there is yet another important consideration; for here inquiry is suggested as to the precise meaning of the phrase: 'whom Jesus loved.' 'Loved'—with what sort of love? No answer is forthcoming from the twice-repeated Gospel allusion: 'reclining in Jesus' bosom,' 'which also leaned back on his breast at the Supper'; the phrase came, no doubt, to be interpreted of devoted attachment as between master and disciple, yet it might simply mean that, host for the occasion, the latter's place

[1] Luthard, *St John's Gospel*, i, p. 95.

[2] Weizsäcker, *Apos. Age*, ii, p. 207. The latter part of the statement, as may appear below, is open to question.

of honour was next to that of Jesus[1]. Neither is it safe to draw conclusions from the term 'loved,' when the question is of two Greek words[2] which, not necessarily of diverse connotation, are indifferently used of the disciple. Unique and distinctive the love might indeed be, yet not so much in respect of quality as in manner of appreciation[3]. It might be added, not in anything exceptional in the manner of its display; for aptly has it been urged[4] that he who discouraged all tendency to jealousy in those who followed him would scarcely have singled out one of them as, above all the others, object of regard and love. What—a supposition hard to entertain—if he had really done so? It would be altogether incredible that such a type of man as the Beloved Disciple should, with unpardonable lack of modesty[5], not only glory in the fact, but go on to publish it abroad! How does the case stand with Paul? If (Gal. ii, 20) he can say: 'Who loved me,' he surely would have shrunk instinctively from vain-glorious self-description as the disciple beloved by Jesus.

[1] A time, no doubt, came when (as, e.g., in Eusebius) the phrase was invested with more than technical significance, and the term ἐπιστήθιος later on applied by Photius, Ephraim, and Dionysius Areo. (see Suicer) signifies a 'bosom friend.' There is an interesting parallel, Cicero, *Ad Fam.* xiv, 4, 3; *Iste* (*sc.* the younger Cicero) *sit in sinu semper et complexu meo.* Hitchcock, by the way, is in error when, citing Euseb. *HE*, v. 24, he writes (*op. cit.* p. 47, note): ὁ ἐπιστήθιος; the phrase as it there stands is: ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ κυρ. ἀναπεσών.

[2] It is surely a case of over-refinement when Westcott (*op. cit.* on Jn xi, 2, 5) differentiates between the δν φιλεῖς placed in the mouth of the sisters and the ἠγάπα of the reference to Jesus. And besides, the use of the latter verb is not invariable when the subject is the Beloved Disciple (see Jn xx, 2, δν ἐφίλει). Nor is this all; as E. G. King (*op. cit.*) remarks, the former verb is found in a connexion where, on Westcott's hypothesis, the latter verb might be expected: ὁ γὰρ πατὴρ φιλεῖ τὸν υἱὸν κ.τ.λ. (Jn v, 20), while Gen. xxxvii, 3 f. (LXX) both verbs are used for the same Hebrew word. Yet a distinction is met with in Homer: οὐδ' ἀγαπαζόμενοι φιλέουσ' (*Od.* vii, 33).

[3] Thus Lampe (*op. cit.* iii, p. 60): *Procul dubio Joannes de amore Jesu ex effectu judicans, se magnopere a Jesu amari inde colligit, quoniam vehementi erga Jesum affectu se incensum ac repletum esse sentit.*' A remark of which Hengstenberg (*op. cit.* ii, p. 372) says that it is 'mehr schimmend als wahr'

[4] By Dr E. G. King.

[5] For objection on this point see, *int. al.*, Wernle, *Quellen*, p. 27; Hilgenfeld, *Einl.* p. 732; von Soden, *Early Christian Liter.* p. 435; Heitmüller, *SNT*, ii, p. 711.

Yet it is at least within the bounds of reasonable conjecture that the Beloved Disciple of the Johannine representation may have had special ground for dwelling on a love which, freely extended to and shared by others, had left a deep and lasting impression on his mind. And perhaps it is just here that the Fourth Gospel itself goes near, certainly not all the way, to identifying him with the rich young ruler of the Synoptics. If the latter he really be, he has experienced the searching look of love of Jesus; and impressed by it at the time, the memory of it is ineffaceable. It remains with him, ever deepening, to the end of life. Perhaps he now and again spoke of it, if only to his more intimate friends[1].

If there be force in the conjecture, the choice rests between two alternatives in respect of the Beloved Disciple sections of the Fourth Gospel. On the one hand, they may be attributed to the enigmatical personage himself, who, from motives of delicacy, has had resort to ambiguity; and if in after times a significance not intended by him was read into the designation, it is not he who is responsible for the mistake[2]. On the other hand it is quite conceivable that they are the additions of another and a later pen; and if so it must be the pen of men who, having enjoyed the disciple's inmost confidences, and heard him discourse on a topic very near to his heart, make him live in the Fourth Gospel as 'the disciple whom Jesus loved.'

In any case his identity, assuming that he was a real personage and not an ideal figure, remains unrevealed.

[1] It is suggested by E. Iliff Robson that some merely technical significance (suggesting the official link between the Master and his School) may attach to the term 'beloved disciple,' and he instances the relation in which Crito stood to Socrates. The suggestion does not seem to fit the case under consideration.

[2] 'It is not impossible,' writes Plummer ('St John' in *Cambr. Gk Test.* p. xxxiv), that the designation was given him by others before he used it of himself.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY J. B. PEACE, M.A., AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Date Due

OCT 24 1966

Library Bureau Cat. No. 1137

BS
2615
J12p 45933
AUTHOR
Jackson, H.L.
TITLE
Problem of the Fourth Gospel

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED
JUN 14 '83	BASEMENT REPAIR	
10/10/66	R.D. Hoag	
NOV 11 '68	E James	